School of Theology at Claremont
10011433721

THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY

CHARLES GORE

The Library

of the

School of Theology

at Claremont

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
1/800-626-7820

THE CHURCH
AND THE MINISTRY

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Roman Catholic Claims. *Crown 8vo.*

The Theological Bearings of Certain Extra-Liturgical Uses of the Blessed Sacrament. Reprinted from the *English Church Review.* With a Preface in Reply to Dr. Stone. *Crown 8vo.*

The Solidarity of the Faith. *Square Fcap. 8vo.* (*Modern Oxford Tracts.*)

The Title 'The Son of Man.' *Crown 8vo.* (*Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications.*)

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

V
55
G63
919

THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY

BY

CHARLES GORE, D.D.

BISHOP OF OXFORD

NEW EDITION

REVISED BY

C. H. TURNER, M.A.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

1919

All rights reserved

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY

PREFACE TO EDITION OF 1919

In publishing a new edition of a book written thirty years ago, on a subject which has been since its first publication under continuous discussion, I cannot but be conscious that it still contains many traces of the time of its origin, notably in the attention paid to Dr. Hatch. But there are two reasons which seem to me to justify this re-issue. First, that it is, as far as I know, the most complete review in one book of all the evidence concerning the Christian Ministry producible from the beginning of Christian history down to the close of the patristic period: secondly, that it has had the advantage of a thorough revision by Mr. Cuthbert Turner, the author of the essay on the Apostolic Succession in the recent volume of *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*. Of his competence to deal with the subject it would be unnecessary for me to speak. Most kindly he has thought it worth while to work through the whole volume, rewriting certain portions of it, *e.g.* that on the original idea of the apostolical succession, pp. 60, 61, that on the evidence concerning the early Alexandrian ministry, pp. 118-126, and that on the Church Orders, pp. 131-135, and a good many of the notes, re-arranging and in part re-writing the Appended Notes on the Laying on of Hands and on the *Didache*, and contributing in his own name that

JUN 14 1922

part of Appended Note D which deals with Canon xiii of Ancyra; and where he has not re-written, revising and bringing up to date the patristic material; besides verifying most of the references, whether to ancient or modern authorities, throughout the book. Of course this does not make him responsible for the argument of the book or the opinions expressed, though I believe they are in substantial agreement with his own, but it does give the book, especially on the historical and critical side, a quite new value, such as no work of mine could ever have had of itself.

There are certain omissions which I should like to explain. A volume written for the first time to-day would have more about Rudolph Sohm's *Kirchenrecht* and his *Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus* and more about Dr. Lindsay's *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1905). But while I hope this volume takes account of what those great writers have said, I have not enlarged it by detailed criticism of their views, because I have done this in *Orders and Unity* (John Murray), p. 77 ff., p. 104 ff. Sohm's views are also examined and criticized in the important volume of Essays just alluded to,—in Essay 1 on *Early Conceptions of the Church* by Dr. Mason.

The second essay in the same volume, on the *Primitive Ministry*, by Dr. Armitage Robinson, is very valuable for its criticism of the idea of a threefold ministry of Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, which belonged to the Church universal at the beginning and is to be distinguished from the local ministry of

presbyters, bishops, and deacons as being 'charismatic' (pp. 60-79). With this criticism I entirely concur. The local ministry was equally 'charismatic,' for every member of the body had his 'charisma.' But I cannot but feel that Dr. Robinson[1] underrates the evidence for the existence of an 'order of prophets clothed with an authority only short of apostolic.' I think the evidence of Acts xiii. 1-3, 1 Cor. xii. 28, Eph. ii. 20, Eph. iv. 11, coupled with the evidence of the *Didache* (which represents a primitive constitution of the Church in a somewhat debased form) does force us to recognise, more than Lightfoot recognised it, that side by side with the apostles, and ranking only after them, there were 'prophets' and 'teachers,' who, though their position cannot be fully defined, may be not inaptly called 'subapostolic orders' in the primitive Church, and did exercise a great apostolic authority, as is recognised, rather reluctantly, in the fifth chapter of this book. And I wish also that Dr. Robinson had not apparently (p. 85) countenanced Lightfoot's statement that the episcopate was formed out of the presbyterate by elevation. I believe that the evidence (reproduced in Chapter VI. below) points away from this conclusion; and I should like to ask him to consider both the first Note appended to this volume, where attention is called to Lightfoot's profession of agreement with Dr. Langen, and also the argument of Dr. Moberly's *Ministerial Priesthood* in criticism of Lightfoot's Essay.

[1] And Dr Wotherspoon, in *The Ministry in the Church* (Longmans, 1916), who wrote before Dr. Robinson's essay was actually published.

It is now too late to remedy the defect, but I wish I had pointed out in Chapter IV. how in St. Mark's Gospel the parabolic intimations which our Lord is represented as giving to His disciples of the nature of the Church after He was gone from them suggest a ministry as part of its constitution. Thus in xii. 9, where He is speaking of the people of God under the figure of a vineyard, after the present husbandmen (*i.e.* the authorities of the Jewish Church) have been 'destroyed' there are to be other more faithful administrators—'He will give the vineyard to others': and in xiii. 34, where the Church is figured as a household, there are to be those who are clothed with administrative 'authority.' It is passages of this kind which support the more definite passages in St. Matthew.

C. OXON:

CUDDESDON, 1919.

FROM THE PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

THERE are two large questions having reference to Christianity which it is important to keep distinct. There is the question whether Christianity is true, and there is the question what, as a fact in history, Christianity has been. It is an indispensable preliminary to all effective dealings with the practical problems, which arise in the attempt to apply and adapt Christianity to current needs and circumstances, that we should study profoundly the genius of Christianity as a continuous historical fact—that we should have a clear answer to the question, what Christianity has been and is. This book, then (assuming broadly the truth of Christianity), attempts to give a partial answer to this second question. It maintains that Christianity is essentially the life of an actual visible society, and that at least one necessary link of connexion in this society is the apostolic succession of the ministry. In a word, this book claims on behalf of the apostolic succession that it must be reckoned with as a permanent and essential element of Christianity. It is an 'apology' for the principle of the apostolic succession.

As being an 'apology' for one clause in the Church's practical and theoretical creed, it will be subject to the usual suspicions of prejudice and want of free criticism to which apologetic literature is

exposed, and from which the literature of 'free thought' is supposed to be by comparison exempt. But it is, perhaps, only while we are very young that we are inclined to believe dissent from orthodox conclusions to afford any guarantee for a just and critical judgment; in fact, the ambition to form or propagate a new theory gives as strong a bias to the mind as the desire to maintain an old one. At any rate, I have tried to do with my 'prejudices' all that a man can do with those inevitable accompaniments alike of his birth into a continuous society and of the first activities of his own individuality; I have tried to subject them to an exact and free examination in the light of reason and history, and to let it correct or verify them.

A word must be said in explanation of the order and contents of this book. The principle of the apostolic succession has been a formative principle in church history. It seemed, therefore, the best course, after making good the preliminary grounds of this investigation (Chapter I.), and explaining the idea of the ministry (Chapter II.), to exhibit the extent to which in church history the principle of the apostolic succession has been postulated and acted upon since the time when the continuous record begins—*i.e.* the latter half of the second century (Chapter III.). The principle is then examined in the light of the Gospels (Chapter IV.), of the apostolic documents (Chapter V.), and of the links of evidence which connect the apostolic age with the continuous history (Chapter VI.). After this nothing remains but to draw conclusions and make applications (Chapter VII.). This order treats the question—What has the Church in fact believed about her ministry? as a preliminary to the investigation of her title-deeds, and it was hardly possible

for the present writer to treat the question in any other order. Whether or no Mr. Darwin is right in maintaining 'that the only object in writing a book is a proof of earnestness, and that you do not form your opinions without undergoing labour' (*Life and Letters*, i. p. 334), it is, at any rate, true that a book had better represent that process of 'labour' by which its writer's opinions have in fact been formed.

The purpose of this book not being primarily or simply archaeological, it has been possible to leave out of discussion a good many elements in the history of the ministry which do not, or so far as they do not, affect the principle. It has been necessary to deal largely in quotations from ancient authors, but it has been possible to omit almost all that bears, *e.g.* upon the growth of the metropolitan and patriarchal systems, the relations of the later episcopate to secular society, and the history of ecclesiastical discipline or canon law in detail.

Pusey House,
St. Peter's Day, 1888.

FROM THE PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION

I do not find myself on reviewing this book after eleven years constrained or able to alter it in any important respect. Scholars of all sorts are, it seems to me, increasingly accepting the principle on which my argument is based, that Christ instituted a visible society, called the Church. But the question is still much agitated (1) whether the visible society thus instituted was endowed by Christ's own action with officers of government and ministry in

the persons of the apostles: (2) whether as the requirements of the future opened out before the apostles, it was made evident to them, as Clement of Rome says it was,[1] that they must hand on the commission of ministerial authority as they had themselves received it: (3) whether thus an apostolic succession in the ministry is an element of continuity in the Church which we cannot dispense with: (4) whether, finally, any but bishops have in fact the authority to hand on ministerial authority and thus maintain the succession.

Now (1) on the first of those points a decidedly negative answer has been returned by Dr. Hort in his posthumously published work on *The Christian Ecclesia.* It necessarily has very great weight as coming from Dr. Hort: and it is, beyond all question, an effective weapon in the hands of those who, like Dr. Brown, in his *Congregational Union Lectures* for 1897, seek to invalidate the principle of the Apostolical succession.[2] But it seems to many of us that it is only Dr. Hort's name which gives weight to his opinion. As an argument against the position that the apostolate is treated in the New Testament documents as really an office of government and ministry in the Church, instituted and empowered by Christ and left by him to carry on His work when His visible presence was withdrawn, it seems to me to be a failure. We only ask for argument in view of the whole evidence, and not merely fragments of it; and I have endeavoured to deal with the matter in an appended note.[3]

(2) I cannot but maintain my former position that the apostles did consciously hand on the minis-

[1] See p. 280.
[2] *Apostolical Succession* by John Brown, B.A., D.D. London, 1898.
[3] See Note M, p. 379.

terial authority which they had received from Christ as a permanent endowment of the Church. No doubt at the first, while the disciples, including the apostles, were expecting an immediate return of Christ, there was very little thought for the future. No doubt also the earliest Church was enriched with miraculous gifts which set the stamp of divine authorization upon certain men as inspired prophets, and made their authorization by the Church a minor matter. But not even recognised inspiration made a prophet independent of the Church. And the question how much was to be allowed to prophets whose divine inspiration was recognised either did not become, or at least did not long remain, a practical question. The importance of the Pastoral Epistles and of the evidence supplied by Clement of Rome [1] and Clement of Alexandria [2] lies precisely in this : that they show us how the apostles, and especially St. Paul and St. John, dealt authoritatively with the ordinary organization of the Church in view of a more or less prolonged future and with experience of its normal requirements.

(3) Again, setting aside the question of the power allowed to one whose divine inspiration the Church acknowledged, no evidence is forthcoming that the principle of the apostolic succession—that is, the requirement for one who would take rank with the 'ministers of the word and sacraments' of an appointment or ordination from above directly or indirectly apostolic—was ever disregarded. There is nothing of real force to be set against St. Clement's letter, with its clear assertion of the principle, and the weight of the tradition as we find it in the later part of the second century. Dr. Brown has recently

[1] See pp. 280 ff.

[2] See pp. 256 ff.

again represented the excommunicated Montanists as maintainers of a primitive or anti-hierarchical Christianity against an ecclesiasticism just becoming dominant. I can only with Mr. Headlam[1] say again, and endeavour to prove,[2] that on the evidence such a view seems to me 'entirely false.'

(4) The last question is whether the highest governing authority in the churches, including the authority to continue the succession, ever belonged to equal bodies of presbyter-bishops. I am sure that I am in no way unwilling to accept such a view if there were sufficient evidence for it, but it still seems to me that the evidence as a whole is against it. Since this book first came out, no one, as far as I have seen, has faced the difficulty of reconciling Jerome's statement about the early Alexandrian Church—which would substantially support this position—with the evidence of Origen's language, which is the language of an Alexandrian, contemporary with the changes which Jerome supposes to have occurred.[3] The *Canons*[4] *of Hippolytus* assure us that the limitation of ordination to bishops was exactly as clearly recognised a principle *circa* 200, as when Jerome and Chrysostom were writing. Further back it seems clear that Clement of Rome does *not* suggest that the local presbyters held the right to appoint their successors, and certainly Ignatius' letters do not contemplate any other churches than those which were governed by the three orders. Thus—while admitting the obscurity and difficulties of the subject—I still think the best supported view is that monepiscopacy had its origin from a more

[1] *Authority and Archæology*, p. 393.
[2] See pp. 189 ff., 249 ff.
[3] See pp. 126-129. [In the present edition, pp. 118-126, the problem has been re-examined in detail.]
[4] [We should now say *Church Order*.]

or less gradual localizing of an authority which in the subapostolic age belonged in many parts of the Church to men of what one may call subapostolic distinction, called prophets, or evangelists, or leaders, and not yet settled as 'bishops' of particular churches. . . .

In dealing with any questions touching the principle of sacramentalism or sacerdotalism, it seems to me that nothing is more important than to observe moderation and balance of statement. On this as much as on any subject, one-sided statement of truth is almost equivalent to positive untruth. This lesson of balance and moderation is on this particular subject taught us, it seems to me, by our Lord Himself. For what do we find in His teaching? Denunciations of the misuse of hierarchical or ecclesiastical power which have in them the most awful force, and which 'Protestants' of all ages have not been slow to use as their most effective weapons. 'Thus have ye made the word of God of none effect because of your tradition.' 'Ye have taken away the key of knowledge.' 'Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte.' Our Lord certainly saw and emphasized all the dangers to which ecclesiastical authority is always liable. But, on the other hand, He refuses to allow us to dispense with its legitimate function because of its misuse. 'The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. Whatsoever therefore they bid you observe, that observe and do. But do not after their works. For they say and do not.' Here is the plainest assertion of the principle that hierarchial authority is to be respected even altogether apart from moral worth. And when our Lord instituted His own Church of the New Covenant, He conferred upon her those very functions of 'binding'

and 'loosing,' the misuse of which under the Old Covenant He had continually under His eye; and He most solemnly attached a supernatural sanction to the powers of 'binding' and 'loosing,' and of remitting and retaining sins, by which His new society was to exercise, through its officers, a divine authority over its members. The point is that the Christ both recognised the dangers of ecclesiastical authority as none other has recognised them, and at the same time solemnly re-inaugurated it. I do not see how this is disputable. None the less one-sided tendencies have constantly prevailed in Christendom. They prevail still. They lie deep in human nature. It is very easy to be simply sacerdotalist, without any due regard to the perils of the principle, or simply protestant against sacerdotalism because of the obvious misuses of ecclesiastical power; but neither attitude is our Lord's. And to discard the principle of ecclesiastical authority because the holders of it at a particular time have seemed to neglect their duty or abuse their power, is in fact to refuse to follow His leading.

This book claims to be an 'apology' for what is in fact the formal or official attitude of the Church of England towards non-episcopal bodies. She does not condemn them, but she refuses to acknowledge their ministry. That is to say, she ordains *de novo* any minister not episcopally ordained who joins her communion ('unless he have formerly been made priest by episcopal ordination'[1]), but does not do so with any who have received an episcopal ordination which she recognises as valid. This is not to judge other men. It is neither to anticipate the divine judgment on their position nor to minimize

[1] Act of Uniformity of 1662.

the evidences of divine blessing which are found again and again to rest upon their work. It is simply to say that their organization has, as far as we can judge, been built up in neglect of a law of the Church with which we have no kind of right to dispense, and which, whatever else we may penitently or joyfully surrender, must be retained as the basis of any future reconciliation.

C. G.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY,
All Saints' Day, 1899.

ERRATA

Page 161, line 4, *for* moveover *read* moreover.
Page 226, sidenote, *for* Apostles *read* Epistles.

CONTENTS

CH. I. THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH

PAGE

Preliminary assumptions—
(1) The genuineness of New Testament documents . 2
(2) The truth of the Incarnation 5
Preliminary inquiry: Did Christ found a visible Church? . 8
The reasonableness of the idea in itself . . 8
(1) Witness of the early Christian belief in a visible Church 11
(unanimous in spite of differences in point of view) . 11
in the West—Tertullian, Cyprian, Irenaeus (holding 'nulla salus extra ecclesiam' together with belief in God's wider dealings), the Roman Church . 12
in the East—Ignatius, Alexandrian writers. . 19
the Apologists—Aristides, Justin, Theophilus . 24
confirmed by the pagan conception of Christianity . 25
(2) The social form of Christianity not due to the secular influence of the 'collegia,' for . . . 26
(*a*) Christian writers show no trace of such influence . 29
(*b*) Christian terminology was derived from Judaism . 30
(3) Witness of the New Testament . . . 30
(*a*) The Gospels—
(i) Christ's method 31
(ii) His institution of social sacraments . . 34
(iii) His Messianic claim . . . 34
(relation of the Church to the 'kingdom of God') . 36
(the Church not exclusive, though it makes an exclusive claim) 37
(*b*) The Acts 38
(*c*) St. Paul's Epistles 39
This doctrine is not inconsistent with the doctrines of faith and liberty 42
but agreeable to the principle of all human society . 43
(Heaven in the Apocalypse a city) . . . 44
Two misconceptions as to the origin of the visible Church—
(1) That it arose out of a previous condition of individualism 44
(2) That it was due to Roman influence: difference between the Roman and Catholic conceptions of church unity 47

PAGE

Notes.—*On the Church as universal according to second century writers* . . . . p. 10
On belief 'in the Church' . . 14
On the idea of an invisible Church 16, 31, 41
On the Church as 'from the beginning' . 17
On Christians as the 'genus tertium' (cf. p. 64 n.[3]) 24
On the double use, present and future, of characteristic Gospel terms . . 37

CH. II. APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

The method of inquiry 53
The principle of Apostolic Succession expounded . . 55
It corresponds to the Incarnation, Sacraments, etc. . 61
The principle more important than the form in which it is embodied 62
Its importance as—
(*a*) a bond of union for a universal spiritual society . 64
(*b*) emphasizing men's dependence on God's gifts . 65
(*c*) satisfying the moral needs of those who minister . 68
Answers to objections that—
(1) 'It is sacerdotal': true and false sacerdotalism . 70
(2) 'Unspiritual men are thus made to mediate spiritual gifts': distinction of character and office . . 80
(3) 'It is opposed to liberty': but liberty is opposed to absolutism, not to authority; the Church not at first or necessarily an imperialist institution . . 82
(4) 'It unchurches presbyterian bodies': but results must not prevent our facing principles . . . 91
(5) 'It cannot be true in fact': this objection not tenable 93
Notes.—*On Morinus* de sacris ordinationibus . p. 57
On the sacramental teaching of the second century Fathers 66
On the priesthood of Christians on behalf of the world 74
On the doctrine of lay-priesthood in catholic theology 75

CH. III. THE WITNESS OF CHURCH HISTORY

Church history bears witness to certain fixed principles—
I., II. The principle of apostolic succession through the episcopate; the requirement for the ministry of episcopal ordination 98
appealed to by Irenaeus 100
accepted by Tertullian 107
anticipated by Hegesippus 108

PAGE

A. Further evidence for the East—
The episcopal successions—
in Palestine, Syria, Asia, Greece, Macedonia, Thrace, Crete . . . 109
the supposed exceptional constitution of the Alexandrian Church . . 115
(*a*) very doubtful in fact . . 118
(*b*) not opposed to the principle of succession 129
The conception of the ministry in—
(i) liturgical writings—*Church Order* of Hippolytus, *Canons of Hippolytus*, *Apostolic Constitutions* . . 131
(ii) canons of councils . . . 141
(iii) Greek Fathers—Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Epiphanius 143

B. Further evidence for the West—
The episcopal successions undoubted . 149
The conception of the ministry in—
(i) Latin Fathers—Cyprian, Lucifer, writers who minimize the distinction of bishop and presbyter, *i.e.* Ambrosiaster, Jerome, etc. . 151
(ii) canons of councils . . . 162
(iii) liturgies 162

III. Ordination was regarded sacramentally . . . 166
and conferred by laying-on of hands. . . 168

IV. It was believed to impose an 'indelible character,' though the distinction of 'valid' and 'canonical' was slowly formulated 170

V. The conception of the ministry from the first involved a sacerdotal principle, though the use of sacerdotal terms was of gradual growth 178

VI. The ministry possessed exclusive powers, *e.g.* only a priest could celebrate the Eucharist . . . 182
Tertullian's statement to the contrary due to Montanist views 186
Montanism—its characteristics . . . 189
not a conservative movement . 191

Summary 194

Notes.—*On the episcopate as a distinct 'order'* . p. 98
On the date of the pseudo-Clementine literature 110
On the conception of the ministry in the Clementines 111
On the 'seventy-two' apostles (cf. p. 198 n.) . p. 112
On the conception of the ministry in Clem. Alex. 116
,, ,, ,, *Origen* . 127

PAGE

On the language of Firmilian on the ministry . 143
On the early Irish episcopate . . . 149
On 'one bishop in a community' . . 151
On the primacy of Peter's see . . . 155
On the Ambrosiaster 157
On bishop and chrism in confirmation . . 159
On Morinus and the traditio instrumentorum . 169
On the signification of laying-on of hands . 170
On reordination . . . 172, 174, 175
On the sources of sacerdotal language . . 181
On Moberly Ministerial Priesthood . . 182

CH. IV. THE INSTITUTION OF THE APOSTOLATE

The postulates of church history to be verified by an appeal to Christ's intention 198
The Gospels generally suggest the institution of a permanent apostolate 199
especially in the commissions to
(1) St. Peter—his relation to (*a*) the other Apostles, (*b*) the whole Church 201
(2) all the Apostles after the resurrection . . . 204
(the commission in St. John xx. to the Apostles rather than to the whole Church) 207
Notes.—*On the seventy and the apostolate* (cf. p. 112) p. 198
On a mode of speech used by Christ . . 200
On St. Peter's relation to the other apostles . 203
On the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist (cf. p. 282) 204

CH. V. THE MINISTRY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

Evidence of St. Paul's Epistles:
(*a*) The office of an apostle 210
(*b*) The Church an organism with differentiated gifts and functions 215
(*c*) The Pastoral Epistles—their importance; they show . 217
(i) a ministry of presbyter-bishops and deacons, not the chief ministry 219
(ii) an extension of the apostolate to 'apostolic men' 221
(iii) St. Paul's idea of ordination by the laying-on of hands 223
Evidence of the other Epistles 226
Evidence of the Acts:
(*a*) The apostolate 229
(*b*) A ministry of 'prophets and teachers' . . 233
(*c*) A local ministry of presbyter-bishops and deacons . 235

PAGE

Summary: (1) The apostolate 237
(2) A subapostolic ministry 238
(3) Presbyter-bishops 239
(4) Deacons 239
(5) Ordination by laying-on of hands . . 240

Evidence is lacking as to—
(*a*) details in the division of functions . . . 240
(*b*) the form of the future ministry . . . 241

Notes.—On the history of the criticism of the Pastoral Epp. p. 224
On ministry of women in the earliest Church . 225
On the Angels of churches in the Apocalypse . 228

CH. VI. THE MINISTRY IN THE SUBAPOSTOLIC AGE

Links connecting this apostolic ministry with the episcopate of church history 243

In the East—
I. St. James originates the 'episcopate' in Jerusalem . 243
II. The *Didache* shows 247
(*a*) a general ministry of 'apostles' and 'prophets' and 'teachers';
(*b*) a local ministry of 'bishops and deacons'
III. St. John (with other apostles) develops 'episcopacy' in Asia 256
This is confirmed by the testimony of Ignatius to the threefold ministry of bishops, presbyters, and deacons 258
(in what sense the presbyterate represents the Apostles) 269
Summary for the East 271

In the West—
IV. Clement's Epistle 273
(*a*) shows a differentiated ministry having succession from the Apostles; 282
(*b*) postulates an order above the presbyter-bishops and deacons 284
V. Polycarp's Epistle 288
implies absence of a bishop at Philippi;
but this is not inconsistent with a superior ministry not localized there 290
VI. The *Shepherd* of Hermas 291
suggests a third order above presbyters and deacons . 294

Summary—of possible theories:
(i) A college of equal presbyters 295
(ii) The bishop hidden in the presbyterate . . . 295
(iii) What alone seems to satisfy the evidence—the episcopate derived from a gradual localization of 'prophets,' 'teachers,' and 'apostolic men' . . . 296

PAGE

Notes.—On a second apostolic council . . . p. 245
On the prophetic office in (1) *bishops* . 250, 254, 267
,, ,, (2) *readers* . . 254
On the presbyter as 'elder in years' (cf. p. 219) 257, 270, 277
On the Ignatian controversy . . . 259
On Ignatius bishop 'of Syria' and Irenaeus bishop 'of Gaul' (cf. p. 100) . 272, 291
On ἐπινομή in Clement of Rome . . 281
On οἱ ἡγούμενοι in Clement and Hermas 285, 293
On the date of the Shepherd *of Hermas* . 292

CH. VII. CONCLUSIONS AND APPLICATIONS

The verdict of history as to (*a*) the Church; (*b*) sacerdotalism; (*c*) episcopal ordination 298

is confirmed by the witness of (*a*) the Gospels (*b*) the apostolic and (*c*) subapostolic documents 300

The cogency of the evidence: it can only be satisfied by the doctrine of the apostolic succession . . . 303

This doctrine in its application
(*a*) invalidates non-episcopal ministries . . . 304
(*b*) recalls episcopal Churches to their true principles . 307

APPENDED NOTES

A. Dr. Lightfoot's Dissertation on 'The Christian Ministry' . 311
B. The early history of the Alexandrian ministry: the evidence of Eutychius 315
C. Rites and prayers of ordination 320
D. (i) Canon xiii. of Ancyra [C. H. TURNER] . . 327
(ii) Chorepiscopi 330
E. Supposed ordinations by presbyters in East and West . 332
F. The theory of the ministry held by Ambrosiaster, Jerome, etc. 335
G. The laying-on of hands: (i) the facts; (ii) their significance 340
H. Montanism 349
I. Prophecy in the Christian Church 353
K. The origin of the titles 'bishop,' 'presbyter,' and 'deacon,' with reference to recent criticism . . . 357
L. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* . . . 367
M. Dr. Hort's view of the Apostolate 379

INDEX 383

CHAPTER I

THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH

THE reader of the history of Christendom cannot fail to be conscious, at each stage of his subject, of the prominent position held in the Church by a Ministry, which is regarded as having a divine authority for its stewardship of Christian mysteries—an authority which is indeed limited in sphere by varying political and ecclesiastical arrangements, but which in itself is believed to be derived not from below but from above, and to represent and perpetuate, by due succession from the Apostles, the institution of Christ. It is this Christian ministry which is to be the subject of the present inquiry. We shall endeavour to ascertain its history, to trace it back through its series of changes to the fountain-head. More than this, we shall endeavour to investigate its authority and search into its title-deeds. Is this ministry, with its claim of an apostolic succession, the mere product of circumstances—valuable just so far as it is found spiritually convenient? As claiming to be a priesthood, does it represent a temporary accommodation of the Christian ideal, more or less necessitated by circumstances, to the Jewish or pagan ideas amidst which the Church spread? Is it a temporary restriction of the free Christian spirit—dangerous, however necessary? Or, on the contrary, is it an original portion of Christ's foundation? Is the episcopal succession, as it meets us in history,

The subject of this inquiry.

simply the fulfilment of Christ's intention, an essential and inviolable element of Christianity till the end?

These are the main questions before us—questions much controverted, yet not on that account incapable of yielding satisfactory solutions. But, like other controverted questions, those which concern the Christian ministry have a tendency to run off their own field and get upon territory foreign to themselves in one direction or another. It will therefore promote clearness if at the beginning the area of the present discussion is carefully marked out.

Preliminary assumptions.

(1) The genuineness of the N. T. records.

(1) As an historical inquiry, the investigation of the *origines* of the Christian ministry involves conclusions as to the date and authorship of a number of documents. In regard to the great majority of these there is no division of opinion which is of serious moment for the present inquiry. But this is not the case with regard to some of the documents contained in the New Testament. The genuineness of the Epistles of St. Peter and St. James and of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians, still more the historical character of the Evangelical records and of the Acts of the Apostles, and the genuineness of St. Paul's Pastoral Epistles, are questions of vital moment in dealing with the history of the ministry. It is well then, in order to narrow the field of inquiry, to make it plain at starting that the genuineness of these Epistles and the historical character of these records are here generally assumed. True, a considerable part of the inquiry is not affected by the decision in one sense or another of these critical questions. But in the discussion of the ministry in the apostolic age it has great weight.[1] If a certain set of conclusions

[1] Thus Professor Harnack (*Expositor*, May 1887) discussed the origin of the Christian ministry on the assumption that not only the Pastoral Epistles but also the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle of St. James are second century documents (pp. 334 n.[1], 335 n.[6]), and that the Epistle to the Ephesians was written 'a considerable time after the Apostle's death' (p. 331). As he truly says—when he is proceeding 'to set forth the chronological data which we possess for the origin and the

is here in the main taken for granted, this is not at all because it is desired to exempt the books of Scripture from free criticism. It is done, because no investigation is satisfactory which does not at starting make plain the basis on which it rests, while a discussion of so large a number of critical questions would occupy too much space in preliminaries. It is done, then, to limit the area of inquiry; but, it must be added, with the clearest conviction that the conclusions assumed are those which the facts warrant. There does not seem to the present writer to be good reason on the whole for doubting, for instance, the unity or the genuineness of the Epistles of St. Paul to the Ephesians, to Timothy, and to Titus. The authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians is guaranteed, not only by the external evidence, not only by its connexion with the more personal Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, but also by the lofty power and richness of thought with which it develops and unifies the fundamental conceptions of predestination and of the Church, which St. Paul had already presented in the Epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians. The Pastoral Epistles are linked together by intense coherence of subject and tone; and there is hardly any writing which can be more certainly pronounced genuine by internal evidence than the second Epistle to Timothy.[1] When we pass to the Acts of the Apostles, there would seem

earliest development of the ecclesiastical constitution'—'This problem would receive the most diverse solutions from those occupying different standpoints regarding the origin of certain New Testament and post-apostolic writings. Any one, for example, who admits the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles will reach quite different conclusions from one who regards them as non-Pauline, and relegates them to the second century' (p. 322). Harnack himself has now modified very largely his views upon the dates of early Christian documents, and especially upon the Acts; see next page, note [2].

[1] See Abp. J. H. Bernard's *Pastoral Epistles* (Cambridge, 1899); Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament* (Murray) cap. xx; Mr. Findlay's essay appended to Sabatier's *Apostle Paul* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1881); G. Wohlenberg *Die Pastoralbriefe* (in Zahn's *Commentar zum Neuen Testament*) 1906; W. M. Ramsay *Historical Commentary on the First Epistle to Timothy* in the *Expositor*, 1909, 1910.

to be scarcely any department of literary controversy in which, within recent years, we have experienced more completely the reassuring effect of thorough inquiry.[1] The remarkably undeveloped Christology of the early chapters: the position assigned to the prophets in the earliest Church: the accurate knowledge, as tested by recent investigations, which the narrative displays of local geography, local sentiment, and the titles of local magistrates: the reiterated evidence which the book affords in its later portions that the author was an eye-witness of what he records[2]—all this taken together goes to guarantee the substantial accuracy of the whole record.[3] Further, the position assigned to the Apostles in St. Paul's Epistles and in the Acts suggests or presupposes some such dealings of Christ with them in particular as the Gospels record. Once again, then (for this reason and in virtue of all the body of considerations which make for the trustworthiness of the evangelical records), it is here taken for granted without scruple that Jesus Christ did really give in

[1] If this was true in 1888 when this volume first appeared, it is conspicuously more true now in 1917. See note [4] below.

[2] See Bp. Lightfoot's 'Illustrations of the Acts from Recent Discoveries,' *Contemp. Review* (May 1878), and, especially, Sir William Ramsay's very remarkable testimony in his work *The Church in the Roman Empire before* A.D. 170 (Hodder and Stoughton, 1893), Part I. Sir W. Ramsay held when he wrote this work that the author of the Acts used for the period of St. Paul's travels a 'travel document' by another hand, written down under the immediate influence of Paul himself, which he dates 'between 60-70 A.D.' But the evidence of style, etc., seems to show that the eye-witness of the 'we' sections is the author of the whole. And Ramsay himself came to hold that St. Luke is the author of the whole book before he wrote *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, 1895.

[3] On the subject of the Acts I may refer (1) to Bp. Lightfoot's article in the *Dict. of the Bible* (ed. 1893), and to his essay 'St. Paul and the Three' (*Epistle to the Galatians*); (2) to Dr. Salmon's *Introd.* lecture xviii.; (3) to the remarkable admissions of one of the last critics amongst those who pay honour to the name of Baur—Dr. Pfleiderer, see his *Hibbert Lectures*, lect. i.; (4) to Dr. A. C. Headlam's article 'Acts of the Apostles' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (Clark, 1898) and the same writer's contribution to *Authority and Archæology* (John Murray, 1899) pp. 348 ff.; (5) to Mr. Rackham's *Acts* (Methuen, 1901). Very remarkable is Harnack's complete *volte-face* upon the Acts; after dating the book in the second century (see page 3 n.[1]), he pushed it back in 1897 (*Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur* i. 250) to A.D. 80-93; while in his *Die Apostelgeschichte* (1908: English translation *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1909) he even leans to a date soon after A.D. 60.

substance those instructions and commissions to His Apostles and to His Church, both before and after His Resurrection, which He is recorded to have given in the narratives of St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John.[1] It is then from no fear of free criticism that the authenticity and trustworthiness of these New Testament documents is here assumed.

(2) The truth of the Incarnation.

(2) It will be also taken for granted that the apostolic interpretation of the Person of Christ is the true one—that He was the Incarnate Son of God. It is important to make this plain, because, though little stress will be laid upon this doctrine, yet our

[1] Those who minimize the historical and emphasize the mystical value of the Fourth Gospel must admit that a mystic at the end of the first century conceived of our Lord as having given the definite commission of Jo. xx. 23. But for myself I adhere to the belief that St. John the Apostle is the real author of the Gospel.

With reference to a point of some importance for the subject of the ministry in St. Matthew's Gospel—our Lord's commission to St. Peter—Prof. Harnack argued (*Contemp. Review*, Aug. 1886, 'The Present State of Research in Early Church History,' p. 230) that an earlier version of the narrative is preserved in the text of Tatian's *Diatessaron*. We have in Armenian St. Ephraem's Commentary on this Harmony of the Gospels. In the Latin translation of this (*Evangelii Concordantis Expositio facta* ▪ *S. Ephraemo*, in Lat. trans. a R. P. Aucher, Mechitarista, ed. Moesinger, Venice, 1876, pp. 153, 154) the words run: Beatus es Simon, et portae inferi te non vincent. Afterwards the words Tu es petra are quoted. Here it appears that it is against *St. Peter* that the gates of death are not to prevail, and nothing is said of the foundation of the Church. But we have not the whole text of the *Diatessaron*; St. Ephraem only quotes it to comment on it. Nor does he always quote it fully. In this case he gives no hint of the words Tu es petra till afterwards, out of their order. Elsewhere it is manifest that he does not quote the whole text; see his comments on St. John, as incorporated in the Harmony (pp. 145-153); and again (p. 66) on the Sermon on the Mount, where the quoted text of St. Matt. v. 22-32 runs thus: 'Sed ego dico vobis: qui dicit fratri suo, fatue . . . qui dicit fratri suo, vilis aut stulte. . . . Audistis quia dictum est: non adulterabis, sed ego dico vobis: quicunque aspicit et concupiscit, adulterat. Si manus tua vel pes tuus scandalizet te . . .' St. Ephraem does not by any means quote the whole text; but he refers to more than he quotes. Thus in the passage under discussion, if we reconstruct his text from his commentary (Dominus cum ecclesiam suam aedificaret, etc., p. 154), it must have run to this effect: 'Blessed art thou, Simon. Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against thee.' The 'thee' may be due simply to the 'it' (αὐτῆς) being referred to πέτρα and not to ἐκκλησία, a reference which Origen *in loco* discusses. St. Ephraem accepted this reference and, interpreting the rock of St. Peter, glossed αὐτῆς as equivalent to σοῦ. There are no traces of any such reading as Harnack imagines to have existed in the Greek MSS. or in the Syriac versions (earlier or later) which have our text. See Zahn's *Diatessaron* pp. 163-4 (in his *Forschungen*, 1 Th., Erlangen, 1881). Moreover, the Arabic version of the *Diatessaron*, published by Ciasca in 1888, and rendered into English by Mr. Hamlyn Hill in 1894, gives no support to Harnack's conjecture: like Victor of Capua's Latin version, it records the promise to St. Peter in the ordinary form. See Hill's *The Earliest Life of Christ* p. 136: *Codex Fuldensis*, ed. E. Ranke, p. 85.

rational attitude towards the development of Christian institutions depends to a certain extent upon our relation to it.[1] The Incarnation represents necessarily a climax in the divine self-revelation. It represents this necessarily, because no closer relation of God to man is conceivable than that involved in the 'Word—Who is God—made flesh' in the historical Person, Christ Jesus, in such sense that 'he who hath seen Him hath seen the Father.' God cannot come any nearer to man, man cannot come any nearer to God, than is effected in Him, in Whom 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' This is 'the end of the days.' As M. Godet strikingly observes: 'The history of the world (from the Christian point of view) is summarized in its essence in these three words: He is coming: He is come: He is coming again.'[2] The development then of God's revelation of Himself comes to its climax in the Incarnation. Henceforth another sort of development begins. All institutions, all races, all individuals are gradually brought into the light of Christ and judged by their relation to Him. Christ develops Himself as the Second Adam, realizing the capacities of all humanity by bringing it all, age by age, race by race, individual by individual, into relation to Himself, till He can 'come again,' in the revelation of the glory of the sons of God, as the acknowledged centre and head of humanity and of the universe.

It is not here proposed to inquire whether analogies will be found in other departments of evolution to what has taken place in the history of religion. This is a large question, which does not belong to our

[1] For example, it seems a grave critical defect in Dr. Hatch's Bampton Lectures, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, that, as he did not explain his relation to certain most significant New Testament documents, so also he did not make it plain whether he really believed the 'supernatural' character of the Person of Christ. If he did, then his propositions about the merely 'natural' development of Christian institutions surely want correcting (lecture i. p. 18).

[2] *Études Bibliques, N. T.* p. 291.

present subject. But the general theory of evolution must, of course, like every other generalization, mould itself to the facts. It must take account, among other things, of religious facts. Now in the history of religion a term *has*, in a certain sense, been reached in the past. The Christian moral standard, the Christian character, claims to be essentially final. The Personality of Christ, as it finds expression in His own language and action and in the belief about Him of His earliest disciples,[1] represents finality. Thus also the grace of His Spirit is the fulness of grace, adequate for all ages and all men; and the truth revealed in Him is 'a faith once for all delivered,' simple and universal, which is to mould human character to the end.[2]

Plainly, then, the rational acceptance of this position about Christ gives us certain premises or presuppositions with reference to the institutions which perpetuate the presence, and represent the will and mind, of Christ. A 'once for all delivered' faith and a once for all covenanted grace associate themselves naturally with a once for all instituted society and a once for all established ministry. The question whether 'the Christian societies, and the confederation of those societies which we commonly speak of in a single phrase as "the visible Church of Christ," were formed without any special interposition of that mysterious and extraordinary action of the divine volition, which, for want of a better term, we speak of as "supernatural"'[3] is rationally conditioned

[1] That is to say, there is no closer or fuller relation of God to man, or of man to God, conceivable, than is involved in Christ's Person as the writers of the New Testament conceive it.

[2] See Bp. Westcott's *Christus Consummator* pp. 124 f., 151 f.

[3] Hatch *B. L.* p. 18. On p. 20, the author says the Church 'is divine, as the solar system is divine.' Now inasmuch as the Church is a human society, he must mean that it is divine, as the British constitution or the Roman empire is divine. But if Christ be personally God, if in virtue of a divine life He burst the tomb and rose the third day from the dead, the society to which He gave birth may presumably be divine in another sense—not as exempted from 'the universe of law,' but because it belongs to that kingdom of law in which effects are relative to causes.

by the question whether the manifestation of the Christ is of this order. A supernatural cause suggests supernatural effects. Nothing will be assumed here about the Church and the ministry. The conclusions shall be drawn strictly from the evidence. But belief in the Incarnation opens our eyes to give due weight to the evidence.

Preliminary inquiry.

Now on the basis of these two assumptions a question arises, which must be determined in this introductory chapter before the proper subject of the present inquiry can be approached. Did Christ found a Church in the sense of a visible society?[1]

Did Christ found a visible Church?

That He should have done so is intelligible enough. As a great writer put it,[2] 'it is only by becoming embodied in the undoubting convictions of a society, by being, as it were, assimilated with its mind and motives—that is to say, with living human minds and wills—and informing all its actions, that ideas have reality, and possess power, and become more than dry and lifeless thoughts.' 'As great moral and social and political ideas are preserved in life and force by being embodied in the common and living convictions of the society which we call the State, so great spiritual ideas, which are the offspring of Christianity, are preserved in life and force by becoming the recognised beliefs and motives of the society which we call the Church.' Christianity would never have done what it has done in the world, if it had been a mere body of abstract truth,

[1] 'For although it is indisputable that our Lord founded a Church, it is an unproved assumption that that Church is an aggregation of visible and organized societies; and although it is clear that our Lord instituted the rite of Christian baptism, it is an unproved assumption that baptism was at the outset, as it has become since, not merely a sign of discipleship, but also a ceremony of initiation into a divine society' (Hatch *B. L.*[2] pref. p. xii). To the idea that the Church is 'a visible society, or aggregation of societies,' is opposed the idea that it is 'synonymous with the elect.'

[2] *The Christian Church* by R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's (Oxford House Papers, No. xvii.) pp. 4, 5, 15.

like a philosophy, to be apprehended by this or that individual. It would never have done what it has done, if it had been embodied only in a book or collection of books. It has lived on, and worked upon men, as a society or group of societies. This, of course, everybody would admit. The question is whether believers in Christ were left to organize themselves in societies by the natural attraction of sympathy in beliefs and aims, and are, therefore, still at liberty to organize themselves on any model which seems from time to time to promise the best results, or whether the divine Founder of the Christian religion Himself instituted *a* society, *a* brotherhood, to be the home of the grace and truth which He came to bring to men: so that becoming His disciple, meant from the first this—in a real sense this only—incorporation into His society. If this was the case, the Church was not created by men, nor can it be recreated from time to time in view of varying circumstances. It comes upon men from above. It makes the claim of a divine institution. It has the authority of Christ. Christ did not, according to this view, encourage His disciples to form societies; He instituted a society for them to belong to as the means of belonging to Him.[1]

Now, as we watch the history of Christendom, we discern 'a great number of organized religious bodies owing their existence and their purpose to Christian belief and Christian ideas'; but in the midst of these we discern also something incomparably more permanent and more universal—one great continuous body—the Catholic Church. There it is; none can overlook its visible existence, let us say from the time when Christianity emerges out of

[1] Of course this antithesis requires guarding. The supernatural influence in the genesis of the Church did not annihilate 'the natural inclination which all men have unto sociable life'; but it controlled and intensified it. This consilience of the natural and supernatural is beautifully expressed by Hooker *E. P.* i. 15. 2.

the gloom of the sub-apostolic age down to the period of the Reformation.[1] And all down this period of its continuous life this society makes a constant and unmistakable claim. It claims to have been instituted as the home of the new covenant of salvation by the Incarnate Son of God. Is the claim which this visible Catholic Church has made a just one? This is our present question: we are not asking yet whether the Church has any particular form of polity by divine institution, but whether the thing itself—the visible society—is the handiwork of Christ. This much we premise: that it would be nothing extraordinary if Christ did institute a Church. It is reasonable to think that,[2] if He came to leave among mankind the inestimable treasures of redemptive truth and grace, He would not have cast them abroad among men, but would have given them a stable home in a visible and duly constituted society—a society simple enough in its principles to be capable of adaptation to the varying needs of ages and nations and individuals, simple enough to be catholic, but organized enough

Intrinsic probability.

[1] Second century writers speak of the Church as *actually* catholic—so strong is their sense that it is meant to be so—i.e. they speak of the Church as having spread universally. Cf. *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν κατοικοῦντα, ἀκούσαντα καὶ πιστεύσαντα . . . ἐκλήθησαν* (Hermas *Sim.* ix. 17); *ἡ ἐκκλησία . . . κατὰ τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς διεσπαρμένη* (Iren. I. x. 1); 'expansa in universum mundum' (*ib.*, IV. xxxvi. 2); *ἡ κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία* (*Mart. Polyc.* 8); *οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες* (Ignatius *ad Eph.* 3).

[2] Cf. the measured words of Butler, *Analogy* pt. II. ch. i: 'As Christianity served these ends and purposes, when it was first published, by the miraculous publication itself, so it was intended to serve the same purposes in future ages by means of the settlement of a visible Church; of a society distinguished from common ones and from the rest of the world, by peculiar religious institutions, by an instituted method of instruction and an instituted form of external religion. Miraculous powers were given to the first preachers of Christianity, in order to their introducing it into the world: a visible Church was established in order to continue it, and carry it on successfully throughout all ages. . . . To prevent [Christianity being sunk and forgotten in a very few ages], appears to have been one reason why a visible Church was instituted; to be like a city upon a hill, a standing memorial to the world of the duty which we owe our Maker, to call men continually . . . to attend to it, and by the form of religion ever before their eyes, remind them of the reality; to be the repository of the oracles of God; to hold up the light of revelation . . . and propagate it throughout all generations to the end of the world.' Cf. also the general argument of his *Charge to the Clergy of Durham*.

to take its place amidst the institutions of the world with a recognisable and permanent character.

Witness of history.

But, as a fact, does history record that He did act thus? The affirmative answer to this question shall be given *first* by exhibiting the impressive unanimity with which the early Christians believed that He did: *secondly*, by making it plain that the existence of the visible Church was not due to external 'secular' influences: *lastly*, by supporting the position from the evidence of the New Testament, especially of the Gospels.

(1) Early Christian belief—

(1) It is plain that the visible society admits of being differently represented, according as it is regarded as the home of divine grace, uniting men by the Spirit through Christ to God and to one another; or as the kingdom of truth, maintaining the 'witness of Jesus'; or as the organ of divine authority, guiding and disciplining the lives of men. But it is equally plain that such modes of representing the Church are not at all incompatible with one another, and all of them equally postulate the *visibility* of the Church.

We proceed then to trace up the different lines of tradition in the Church so as to show that the difference of colour put upon Christian truth by the varieties of spiritual temperament and the varying claims of circumstance did not affect this central position. And as, of recent years, considerable originality has been assigned to the 'Augustinian theory' of the Church,[1] we will make a beginning with the Church of St. Augustin—the Church of Africa. Now, whatever, novelty there may have been in Augustin's presentation of the matter,[2] at

in the West:

[1] E.g. by Dr. Hatch *B. L.*[8] pp. xii, xiii.

[2] St. Augustin's doctrine of the Church is thus stated by Dr. Cunningham (*St. Austin* p. 116): 'The kingdom of God was not a mere hope, but a present reality, not a mere name for a divine idea, but an institution, duly organized among men, subsisting from one generation to another; closely inter-connected with earthly rule, with definite guidance to give, and a definite part to take in all the affairs of

least he did not originate the idea of a visible Church. Let us take our earliest representative of African Christianity, Tertullian (at the end of the second century), and listen to what he teaches on the subject, in argument with the Gnostics, giving it as the one thing certain, whatever may be matter for question.

Tertullian.

'Christ Jesus our Lord,' he says,[1] 'so long as He was living on earth, spoke Himself either openly to the people or apart to His disciples. From amongst these He had attached to His person twelve especially, who were destined to be the teachers of the Gentiles. Accordingly, when one of these had fallen away, the remaining eleven received His command, as He was departing to the Father after His Resurrection, to go and teach the Gentiles, who were to be baptized into the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. At once, then, the Apostles (the very name indicates "mission"), after adding Matthias to their number as the twelfth in the place of Judas on the authority of the prophecy in David's psalm, and after receiving the promised strength of the Holy Ghost to enable them to work miracles and preach, first of all bore witness throughout Judaea to faith in Jesus Christ and established churches, and afterwards going out into the world proclaimed the same teaching of the same faith to the Gentiles, and forthwith founded

---

actual life. To him the kingdom of God was an actual Polity, just as the Roman Empire was a Polity too: it was "visible" in just the same way as the earthly State, for it was a real institution with definite organization, with a recognised constitution, with a code of laws and means of enforcing them, with property for its uses, and officers to direct it.' This would represent what is meant by 'the Augustinian theory.' But in fact St. Augustin's relation to the idea of the Church is a complex one: see Hermann Reuter *Augustinische Studien*, esp. pp. 101, 150-1, 485 ff., and Bp. Robertson's Bampton Lectures *Regnum Dei* (Methuen, 1901), lect. v.

[1] *de Praescr.* 20: 'Christus Iesus, Dominus noster, permittat dicere interim, quisquis est, cuiuscumque dei filius, cuiuscumque materiae homo et deus, . . . quamdiu in terris agebat, ipse pronuntiabat sive populo palam sive discentibus seorsum, ex quibus duodecim praecipuos lateri suo allegerat destinatos nationibus magistros. Itaque uno eorum decusso reliquos undecim digrediens ad Patrem post resurrectionem iussit ire et docere nationes tinguendas in Patrem et Filium et in Spiritum sanctum. Statim igitur apostoli, quos haec appellatio missos interpretatur, assumpto per sortem duodecimo Matthia in locum Iudae ex auctoritate prophetiae quae est in psalmo David, consecuti promissam vim Spiritus sancti ad virtutes et eloquium, primo per Iudaeam contestata fide in Iesum Christum et ecclesiis institutis, dehinc in orbem profecti eandem doctrinam eiusdem fidei nationibus promulgaverunt. Et perinde ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt, a quibus traducem fidei et semina doctrinae ceterae exinde ecclesiae mutuatae sunt, et cottidie mutuantur, ut ecclesiae fiant. Ac per hoc et ipsae apostolicae deputabuntur, ut soboles apostolicarum ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est. Itaque tot ac tantae ecclesiae una est illa ab apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes primae et omnes apostolicae, dum una omnes. Probant unitatem communicatio pacis et appellatio fraternitatis et contesseratio hospitalitatis, quae iura non alia ratio regit, quam eiusdem sacramenti una traditio.'

churches in every city, from which all other churches in their turn have received the tradition of the faith and the seeds of doctrine; yes, and are daily receiving, that they may become churches; and it is on this account that they too will be reckoned apostolic, as being the offspring of apostolic churches. Every kind of thing must be classed with reference to its origin. Accordingly, many and great as are the churches, yet all is that one first Church which is from the Apostles, that one whence all are derived. So all are the first, and all are apostolic, while all are one: the proofs of unity are the fellowship of peace and the title of brotherhood and the interchange of hospitality—rights which are based on no other principle than the one handing down of the same religion.'

Here we have a perfectly clear conception of the one Catholic Church, founded in fulfilment of Christ's intentions by His immediate ambassadors, of which every local church is the representative for a particular area. Behind 'the churches,' and prior to them in idea, is the one Church which each embodies.[1] Thus the Church is to Tertullian's mind God's institution for man's education and salvation. To the Church belong the Scriptures; so utterly in fact does he refuse to separate the books of the Church from herself that he declines, in theory at least, even to argue as to the meaning of the Scriptures with those outside the Church, because they do not belong to them. So little does he conceive of the Christian religion as an abstract doctrine written in a Book![2]

It was, then, through membership in this one apostolic Church, catholic and local, that African Christians believed themselves to inherit the grace of Christ. Communion with God depended on communion with His Church. 'He cannot have God for

[1] The thought of salvation *in the Church* is so prominent in Tertullian's mind that he finds it in the Lord's Prayer. Speaking of the title 'Father,' he says (*de Orat.* 2): 'Item in Patre Filius invocatur; Ego enim, inquit, et Pater unum sumus. Ne mater quidem ecclesia praeteritur. Siquidem in filio et patre mater recognoscitur, de qua constat et patris et filii nomen.'

[2] *de Praescr.* 19: 'Ergo non ad scripturas provocandum est, nec in his constituendum certamen, in quibus aut nulla aut incerta victoria est aut parum certa. Nam etsi non ita evaderet collatio scripturarum, ut utramque partem parem sisteret, ordo rerum desiderabat illud prius proponi, quod nunc solum disputandum est: **quibus competat fides ipsa, cuius sint scripturae.**'

Cyprian c. A.D. 255.

his father,' Cyprian is fond of emphasizing,[1] 'who has not the Church for his mother.' 'Dost thou believe' —so runs the baptismal interrogation in St. Cyprian's day—'in the remission of sins and eternal life through the holy Church?'[2]

There is no reason to think that such a question would have startled or shocked the faithful in any part of the Christian Church. Certainly Irenaeus, the bishop of Lyons, who represents the church of Gaul and the churches of Asia where he had been brought up, held the same belief in the Church and made the same exclusive claim for it.

Irenaeus c. A.D. 185.

'In the Church,' he says, 'God placed apostles, prophets, doctors, and the whole operation of the Spirit, and all who do not have recourse to the Church do not participate in Him, but deprive themselves of life. . . . For where the Church is there is the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is there is the Church and all grace.' 'God will judge all those who make schisms. . . . No reformation can be wrought by them which can compensate for the injury of the schism. God will judge all those who are outside the truth—that is, who are outside the Church.' 'The Church has been planted as the paradise in this world: so then, of every tree of the paradise ye

[1] *Ep.* lxxiv. 7: 'Ubi et ex qua et cui natus est, qui filius ecclesiae non est? ut habere quis possit Deum patrem, habeat ante ecclesiam matrem.' Cf. *Ep.* lv. 24; 'Quisque ille est et qualiscumque est, Christianus non est qui in Christi ecclesia non est.' *Ep.* lxxiii. 21: 'Salus extra ecclesiam non est.' Cyprian's conception of the bishop constituting the church will be brought out later, pp. 153, 154.

[2] *Ep.* lxix. 7: 'Credis in remissionem peccatorum et vitam aeternam per sanctam ecclesiam?' *Ep.* lxx. 2: 'Credis vitam aeternam et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam ecclesiam?'

Bp. Westcott (*Historic Faith* p. 116 and Note iii. p. 186) lays stress on the idea that 'we do not say we believe in' the Church: we believe only 'that it is.' This distinction comes from Rufinus; cf. his Commentary on the Creed § 36: 'hac itaque praepositionis syllaba Creator a creaturis secernitur et divina separantur ab humanis.' Cf. St. Augustin *de Fide et Symbolo* 21. But this would apply neither to all the western Creeds (see, in Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica*, Creeds xix, xxvi, xxvii, xxx, xxxvii-viii, and the early Spanish Creed in 'Priscillian' *Tract* ii. p. 36), nor to the eastern form of the Constantinopolitan Creed (the form of most authority in the Church) with the earlier eastern Creeds (see Pearson *On the Creed* art. ix, notes 52, 53; and Westcott *l.c.* p. 195). It is therefore surely impossible to lay stress on it. That the early Western Church understood the εἰς 'in' to apply to the holy church as well as to the Holy Spirit, seems amply established for the Apostles' Creed by the forms printed in A. E. Burn's *Facsimiles of the Creeds* (Henry Bradshaw Society, 1908) plates iv a, b, vi, x, while plates xii, xiii show similarly that the early Latin versions of the Constantinopolitan Creed followed the Greek original by repeating 'in' before 'unam catholicam et apostolicam ecclesiam.'

shall eat, says the Spirit of God—that is, of every Scripture of the Lord.'[1]

(recognition also of God's wider dealings.)

It might be asked how St. Irenaeus reconciles this exclusive claim which he makes for the Church with a truth to which he also gives expression—namely, that God's revelation of Himself through His Son, Who is the Eternal Word, 'the Light which lighteneth every man,' is in a sense universal, and that in order to the apprehension of this universal revelation there is a universal capacity for faith which is exhibited in all moral obedience to God wherever found.[2] Irenaeus teaches this, with the Alexandrians and with Justin Martyr.[3] With the last-named father he

[1] The passages translated in the text are: III. xxiv. 1 (quoted below p. 103 n.[3]):

IV. xxxiii. 7: 'Ἀνακρινεῖ δὲ τοὺς τὰ σχίσματα ἐργαζομένους, κενοὺς ὄντας τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγάπης καὶ τὸ ἴδιον λυσιτελὲς σκοποῦντας ἀλλὰ μὴ τὴν ἕνωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας· καὶ διὰ μικρὰς καὶ τὰς τυχούσας αἰτίας τὸ μέγα καὶ ἔνδοξον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τέμνοντας καὶ διαιροῦντας καὶ ὅσον τὸ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἀναιροῦντας· . . . οὐδεμία γὰρ τηλικαύτη δύναται πρὸς αὐτῶν κατόρθωσις γενέσθαι, ἡλίκη τοῦ σχίσματός ἐστιν ἡ βλάβη. Iudicabit autem et omnes eos qui sunt extra veritatem, id est qui sunt extra ecclesiam.'

V. xx. 2: 'Fugere igitur oportet sententias ipsorum [haereticorum] . . . confugere autem ad ecclesiam, et in eius sinu educari, et dominicis scripturis enutriri. Plantata est enim ecclesia paradisus in hoc mundo. Ab omni ergo ligno paradisi escas manducabitis, ait Spiritus Dei; id est, ab omni scriptura dominica manducate.'

The connexion in the mind of the early Church between schism and heresy is very close. The fundamental idea of heresy is that of *self-willed separatism* or particularism. Cf. Rothe *Anfänge der christlichen Kirche* § 53 p. 563 f. and pseudo-Athan. *Dict. et Interpret. Parabol. Evang.* qu. 38 (quoted by Rothe *l.c.* p. 566) Πόθεν λέγεται αἵρεσις; ἀπὸ τοῦ αἱρεῖσθαί τι ἴδιον, καὶ τοῦτῳ ἐξακολουθεῖν. This expresses the primitive idea.

Irenaeus' conception of the organization of the Church is presented later (p. 102 ff.).

[2] Iren. IV. vi. 5, 7: 'Et ad hoc Filium revelavit Pater, ut per eum omnibus manifestetur et eos quidem, qui credunt ei iusti, in incorruptelam et in aeternum refrigerium recipiat; credere autem ei, est facere eius voluntatem. . . . Nemo cognoscit . . . Patrem, nisi Filius et quibuscumque Filius revelaverit. Revelaverit enim non solum in futurum dictum est, quasi tunc inceperit Verbum manifestare Patrem cum de Maria natus est, sed communiter per totum tempus positum est. Ab initio enim assistens Filius suo plasmati, revelat omnibus Patrem, quibus vult et quando vult et quemadmodum vult Pater; et propter hoc in omnibus et per omnia unus Deus Pater et unum Verbum Filius et unus Spiritus et una salus omnibus credentibus in eum.'

[3] Justin *Apol.* i. 46: Τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτότοκον τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι ἐδιδάχθημεν καὶ προεμηνύσαμεν λόγον ὄντα, οὗ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε. καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοί εἰσι, κἂν ἄθεοι ἐνομίσθησαν, οἷον ἐν Ἕλλησι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς, ἐν βαρβάροις δὲ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἀνανίας καὶ Ἀζαρίας καὶ Μισαὴλ καὶ Ἠλίας καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί, ὧν τὰς πράξεις ἢ τὰ ὀνόματα καταλέγειν μακρὸν εἶναι ἐπιστάμενοι τανῦν παραιτούμεθα. ὥστε καὶ οἱ προγενόμενοι ἄνευ λόγου βιώσαντες ἄχρηστοι καὶ ἐχθροὶ τῷ Χριστῷ ἦσαν καὶ φονεῖς τῶν μετὰ λόγου βιούντων· οἱ δὲ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες καὶ βιοῦντες Χριστιανοὶ καὶ ἄφοβοι καὶ ἀτάραχοι ὑπάρχουσιν. or the Alexandrians see p. 23 n.[3].

would, no doubt, recognise all who, even in heathen lands as well as among the Jews, 'lived or live with right reason,' as the 'friends of Christ,' the Eternal Reason, and even as 'Christians.' How would he reconcile such a position with the exclusive claim of the Church? Possibly by holding that all who had not had the opportunity of becoming members of the Church while on earth would, if they had been true to their light, be received into the Church in Paradise. At any rate the reconciliation was not effected by the idea of an *invisible Church* to which they belonged—an invisible Church containing the true servants of God whether they belonged to the visible Church or not. Neither the existence of good men outside the Church, nor the presence of bad men inside it, ever drove the Christian Fathers, whether eastern or western, to this hypothesis.[1]

[1] The Church on earth was regarded as subdivided into false and true members—the latter constituting the κυρίως ἐκκλησία of Origen, the corpus Christi verum of Jerome and Augustin. Neither of these (as Rothe, *Anfänge* p. 618 n. 44, remarks) 'agrees with the invisible Church of the Protestants.' The point of difference is specially this, that, whereas the members of the 'invisible Church' are regarded as belonging indifferently to any or no ecclesiastical unity, with Origen and Augustin the conception is the opposite. The membership in the 'true Church' depends upon membership in the visible Church on earth. The true Church is a subdivision of the actual Church—its genuine members: 'non omnes qui tenent ecclesiam, tenent et vitam aeternam' (Aug. *de Bapt.* v. 20); 'multi . . . sunt in sacramentorum communione cum ecclesia, et tamen iam non sunt in ecclesia' (*ad Catholicos de Unit. Eccl.* 74). See, however, Robertson on Augustin *Regnum Dei*, pp. 187 ff., and on the Reformers, pp. 354 ff. Dr. Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah* p. 230, says: 'Let me premise that I think the distinction cannot be maintained, which was first introduced by the theology of the sixteenth century ["the idea appears pretty fully developed in Wiclif," footnote], between a visible and invisible Church in this world, the latter consisting only of the truly godly. Not only is such a distinction uncountenanced by Scripture, but the very idea of a Church is that of a Society which has its officers and organisation. It is a contradiction in terms to call a number of individuals a Church who are not united together in a body. The moment they do begin to unite, by virtue of their supposed common characteristic of genuine godliness, they cease to be invisible. There have been such attempts to form a pure Church; but history and the warnings of our Lord Himself have taught most of us what to think of them.' Of course the greater part of the Church is to us invisible, but that is because its members are no longer on earth, and they enjoy 'perfect fellowship with one another, as well as with their Lord.' Cf. also William Law's *Third Letter to the Bishop of Bangor*, at the beginning—a powerful and racy passage. Of course the truth that the Church is a visible society, containing evil as well as good, is involved in our Lord's language in the parables of the Net gathering of every kind and of the Field of wheat and tares: it is involved also in St. Paul's whole conception of the Church and of 'the saints,' that is of Christians as *bound to holiness* by the

The Roman Church.

From Africa and Gaul we come to the great western centre—Rome. Certainly the idea of the visible Church and its unity was prominent there at the time when Victor, the bishop, attempted to excommunicate the churches of Asia for keeping Easter after their own specially Johannine tradition. He endeavoured, says Eusebius,[1] 'to cut them off from the common unity' and make them 'utterly excommunicate.' He was reproved by Irenaeus for introducing into the Church the idea of a rigid uniformity, in place of the common faith, as the bond of union. He is reminded how, in the middle of the century, his predecessor Anicetus had kept his fellowship with the Asiatic Polycarp, in spite of their difference as to this particular custom—'those who observed it, and those who did not, keeping the peace of the whole Church.'

Victor. A.D. 190-200.

Hermas.

But we may go back in the same church at least to the earlier half of the second century, to the days of Hermas, the seer of the *Shepherd*. In his visions the Church is represented as an aged lady, who appears to Hermas, and 'through whom he receives visions and revelations.' She is aged, it is explained to him, because 'she is the first creation of God, on whose account the world was made.'[3] The Church is

consecration laid upon them in virtue of being baptized members of Christ, but not necessarily holy. Still it was only when the long repose of the first half of the third century made the Christian profession popular and easy, that the full weight of the problem came upon the Church. In part there was a disposition to meet it by pressing the rigorous discipline which had grown up, at any rate in the West, under the simpler conditions of earlier times: and this disposition, passing into an impatient refusal to tolerate the 'mixed' condition of the Church, was a fruitful source of schism. In part stress was laid upon the Church on earth being only an outpost of a celestial society (cf. Tertull. *de Bapt.* 15 una ecclesia in caelis), an earthly image of it (cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 8. 66 εἰκὼν τῆς οὐρανίου ἐκκλησίας ἡ ἐπίγειος), or a preparation-ground for it: and thus necessarily imperfect.

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24. 9.

[2] See further on the date, in chap. VI. p. 292.

[3] *Vis.* ii. 4: Τὴν πρεσβυτέραν, παρ' ἧς ἔλαβες τὸ βιβλίδιον, τίνα δοκεῖς εἶναι; ἐγώ φημι· Τὴν Σίβυλλαν. Πλανᾶσαι, φησίν, οὐκ ἔστιν. Τίς οὖν ἐστίν; φημί. Ἡ ἐκκλησία, φησίν. εἶπον αὐτῷ· Διατί οὖν πρεσβυτέρα; Ὅτι, φησίν, πάντων πρώτη ἐκτίσθη· διὰ τοῦτο πρεσβυτέρα, καὶ διὰ ταύτην ὁ κόσμος κατηρτίσθη. Cf. *Vis.* iv. 1: αἱ ἀποκαλύψεις καὶ τὰ ὁράματα ἃ μοι ἔδειξεν διὰ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ. Cf. II. Clem. *ad Cor.* 14: and Odes of Solomon iv. 3 (ed. Abp. Bernard in *Texts and Studies* viii. 3, pp. 48-50), 'Thy sanctuary thou hast designed before thou didst

here thought of as in a way existing from the beginning in the purpose of God, in the ideal world. But this divine Idea has become a fact. The actual Church, made up of those yet alive and of some who have departed in the faith of Christ, is represented to Hermas under the figure of a tower with a marvellous unity, which is being built by the angels of God upon the waters of baptism, the stones which are used for the tower, and those which are rejected, representing all sorts of men.[1] This actual Church which is in process of being constructed is declared to be identical with the ideal Church. What existed before in idea is now real.[2] And this real, visible Church is the only way of salvation. 'When the tower is finished, those who have not yet repented can no longer find place, but will be cast out.'[3] There is another vision of the building of the tower to the same effect.[4] In this it is made plain that the Church in its present state is imperfect. Many, who had been gathered out of all nations 'into the one body,' have fallen away and been cast out for awhile or for ever. Those who are members of the Church at present are evil as well as good; many will have to be cast out; and thus the Church as a whole will at the last be purified into complete holiness and unity. Still, as it is, the Church represents God's will, God's purpose of redemption; and those who separate themselves

make places.' Origen too, like Augustin, recognised that the Church had in some sense begun to exist from the beginning, cf. *in Cant.* i. 11, 12: 'prima etenim fundamenta congregationis ecclesiae statim ab initio sunt posita.'

[1] *Vis.* iii. 2-8.

[2] The tower which is the visible Church on earth *is* the ideal Church which appeared to Hermas, Ὁ μὲν πύργος ὃν βλέπεις οἰκοδομούμενον, ἐγώ εἰμι, ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἡ ὀφθεῖσά σοι καὶ νῦν καὶ τὸ πρότερον (*Vis.* iii. 3). If Hermas' Church of the divine Idea is spoken of 'as a sort of Aeon' (Rothe *Anfänge* p. 612 n. 42), it must be remembered that the Idea is actualized to Hermas, just as the Word is made flesh. This differentiates the Church's system from the Gnostic; the Valentinian Aeon ἐκκλησία is (by contrast) only ideal. For the Jewish form of the eternal Church see *Book of Enoch* c. 39.

[3] *Vis.* iii. 5. There is, however, an inferior salvation implied for some who do not find place in the tower, if they repent, and after a purgatorial purification (*ib.* 7).

[4] *Sim.* ix. This tower is built upon the great Rock, Christ.

from it, separate themselves from the hope of salvation—like the covetous or the extortionate. They are represented as men diseased: 'they who are covered with scabs are they who denied their Lord and turned not to Him, but have become dry and desert-like, and cleave not to the saints of God, but, isolating themselves, lose their own souls.' [1] How could imagery express more strongly the idea of salvation through the Church? [2]

We may go back in the same church to a yet earlier date, and still in the Epistle of Clement we shall find, without poetry or vision, the sense of the Church as vivid as possible. The Church in that Epistle is a visible society, with the divine principle of order stamped upon her, as upon the Church of the old covenant, by God's authority,[3] and there is a common tradition over the different local churches, for neglecting which that at Rome is bound to take her sister at Corinth to task. The western temper no doubt tended later (as will be seen) to colour the idea of the Church. As the church at Rome became Latinized and came to inherit the secular prerogatives of the Roman name in addition to her own spiritual privileges, no doubt her influence gave a new tone—the tone of secular empire—to Christian institutions. Thus the doctrine of the Church becomes materialized, but it is a complete mistake to suppose that the conception of the Church, or of the visible unity of the Church, was at all western in origin.

Clement c. A.D. 96.

Ignatius of Antioch was a thorough oriental, and he writes to churches which inherit the fruits of the last years of apostolic influence when that influence had

In the East: Ignatius c. A.D. 110-115.

[1] *Sim.* ix. 26.

[2] The commission to Clement to send the book to *the other cities* (εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις) implies the sense that the local churches are essentially connected (*Vis.* ii. 4).

[3] Clem. *ad Cor.* 40-44; see further chap. vi. p. 278 ff. 'The new law of the Church' Clement 'most characteristically connected with the two models of the political and military organization of the Roman state and the sacerdotal hierarchy of the Jewish theocracy' (Pfleiderer *Hibbert Lectures* p. 252).

its centre at Ephesus. Yet it is impossible to conceive a teaching about the Church as a visible society more intense, more passionate, than that of Ignatius. Christ's authority is perpetuated in visible societies with a visible organization, and each of these societies, each church, with its bishop and priests and deacons, is an embodiment of what is not local, but catholic.[1] 'Where the bishop appears, there let the people be, as where is Christ Jesus, there is the Catholic Church.' 'He who is within the sanctuary is pure, he who is outside is impure, that is to say, he who does anything apart from bishop and presbytery and deacons is not pure in his conscience.' 'If any one follows a separatist he does not inherit the kingdom of God.'[2]

The Church may be represented from different points of view. It may be emphasized, as was said above, as the home of a divine grace covenanted to its members alone; this is perhaps the thought specially suggested by the scriptural metaphors of the body of Christ and of the branches of the Vine. It may be emphasized from the side of authority, the Church being the mistress of men to subdue and to rule them; and this became the thought specially dear to the Roman genius. It may be emphasized also from the side of the revelation of truth, the Church being the school of truth to train human characters under its discipline; and no doubt to the Alexandrians it is from this point of view that Christianity is mostly though not of course exclusively,[3] thought of and

The Alexandrians—

[1] *ad Smyrn.* 8: 'The bishop is the centre of each individual Church, as Jesus Christ is the centre of the universal Church' (Lightfoot's note). For further quotations and discussion see chap. VI. p. 262 ff.

[2] *ad Trall.* 7: *ad Philad.* 3.

[3] See, e.g., a fine passage in Origen (*c. Cels.* vi. 48) where the Church is described as an organism, ensouled by the indwelling Word—σῶμα Χριστοῦ φασιν εἶναι οἱ θεῖοι λόγοι, ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ψυχούμενον, τὴν πᾶσαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν· μέλη δὲ τούτου τοῦ σώματος εἶναι ὡς ὅλου τούσδε τινὰς τοὺς πιστεύοντας. ἐπείπερ ὥσπερ ψυχὴ ζωοποιεῖ καὶ κινεῖ τὸ σῶμα, οὐ πεφυκὸς ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ κινεῖσθαι ζωτικῶς, οὕτως ὁ λόγος κινῶν ἐπὶ τὰ δέοντα καὶ ἐνεργῶν τὸ ὅλον σῶμα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κινεῖ καὶ ἕκαστον μέλος τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

loved. Christ is the Truth. It is on the Church's truth that the minds of Athanasius and Didymus are mainly fixed ;[1] it is the divine philosophy—superseding all the fragmentary truth possible to the world apart from Christ by including it in a completer, purer whole—that Clement and Origen love. But it is quite an error to suppose that they were the less *churchmen* on this account. We have in St. Augustin's Confessions an account of an old Platonic philosopher, Marius Victorinus, trying to induce a simple-hearted bishop to consider him a Christian on account of his convictions, without requiring him to come into the Church. Did walls, he asked, make Christians? The question was one better left without a direct answer. But at any rate the philosopher was given to understand that he could only become a Christian by being baptized into the Christian body. This 'ecclesiastical temper' was as much that of Clement and Origen as of later Alexandrians.

Clement may indeed have had an idea of a 'Church within a Church,' a Church of the men of knowledge who get beyond mere faith; but men of faith and men of knowledge are at one in common church membership, in common use of the sacraments, in common adhesion to 'the Church's rule,' 'the apostolic and ecclesiastical right rule of beliefs.'[2] The faith is not a philosophy; it is embodied in the one visible Church, true, ancient, catholic, and

Clement c. A.D. 190-200.

[1] This is very beautifully illustrated by Didymus' commentary on the Psalms. The guidance and food of the soul is mainly the Church's truth, as expressed in her exact dogmas, and his feeling towards this truth is repeatedly expressed with the greatest genuineness and force. Later, in the fifth century, the theology of Cyril has a quite different tone from the theology of Leo. The first thought of the one is truth and life, of the other government.

[2] Men of understanding are described as ὅσοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ [Χριστοῦ] *σαφηνηθεῖσαν τῶν γραφῶν ἐξήγησιν κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα ἐκδεχόμενοι διασώζουσιν* (*Strom.* vi. 15. 125); cf. *ἡ ἀποστολικὴ καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ὀρθοτομία τῶν δογμάτων* (*ib.* vii. 16. 104). The heretic is a man who has 'kicked at the tradition of the Church and leaped off to the opinions of human heresies' (*ib.* vii. 16. 95); he neither enters the kingdom of heaven himself, nor allows those whom he deceives to arrive at the truth.

apostolic. This only, in contrast to all the late-devised 'schools' of heresy which cannot be called Churches, is the home of the elect, the one true virgin mother of human souls.[1] 'This being the case,' he says, 'it is plain that these later-born heresies and those yet subsequent to them are modern distortions of the most ancient and true Church. So then it has, I think, been made plain from what has been said that the true and really original Church is one, and into it the elect according to God's purpose are gathered. . . . The One Church is associated with the nature of the One God. In substance, in conception, in origin, in excellence, we say that the original and universal Church is one only, having nothing like or equal to herself.'[2]

Origen.

Just in the same way the truth which Origen set himself with such noble zeal to expound and to put into relation to the whole of knowledge, was no abstract truth to be thought out by the free action of the individual mind; it was a truth committed to a society and, though the sanctified reason could explain, elucidate, accommodate it, it could not transgress or neglect 'the rule of faith' without being self-condemned.[3] 'Let the preaching of the Church be preserved,' he says at the beginning of the book which most laid him open to accusations of heresy,

A.D. 228-231.

[1] Cf. *Strom.* vii. 17. (quoted in the next note); vii. 15. 92; *Paed.* i. 6. 42 (on the one virgin mother). For further quotations see Rothe *Anfänge* pp. 584 f., 593, 601, etc.; and Dr. Bigg's Bampton Lectures, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, pp. 86, 153 n.[2], 98-100 [ed. 2, pp. 118, 192 n.[2], 131-133], etc.

[2] *Strom.* vii. 17. 107: Ὧν οὕτως ἐχόντων συμφανὲς ἐκ τῆς προγενεστάτης καὶ ἀληθεστάτης ἐκκλησίας τὰς μεταγενεστέρας ταύτας καὶ τὰς ἔτι τούτων ὑποβεβηκυίας τῷ χρόνῳ κεκαινοτομῆσθαι παραχαραχθείσας αἱρέσεις· ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ἄρα φανερὸν οἶμαι γεγενῆσθαι, μίαν εἶναι τὴν ἀληθῆ ἐκκλησίαν τὴν τῷ ὄντι ἀρχαίαν, εἰς ἣν οἱ κατὰ πρόθεσιν δίκαιοι ἐγκαταλέγονται· ἑνὸς γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἑνὸς τοῦ κυρίου, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἄκρως τίμιον κατὰ τὴν μόνωσιν ἐπαινεῖται μίμημα ὂν ἀρχῆς τῆς μιᾶς. τῇ γοῦν τοῦ ἑνὸς φύσει συγκληροῦται ἐκκλησία ἡ μία, ἣν εἰς πολλὰς κατατέμνειν βιάζονται αἱρέσεις. κατά τε οὖν ὑπόστασιν κατά τε ἐπίνοιαν κατά τε ἀρχὴν κατά τε ἐξοχὴν μόνην εἶναί φαμεν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἐξοχὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καθάπερ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς συστάσεως, κατὰ τὴν μονάδα ἐστὶν, πάντα τὰ ἄλλα ὑπερβάλλουσα καὶ μηδὲν ἔχουσα ὅμοιον ἢ ἴσον ἑαυτῇ.

[3] See Bigg *B. L.* lecture v. init.

'handed down through the order of succession from the Apostles, and remaining up to the present time in the churches: that alone is to be believed as truth which is in no disagreement with the ecclesiastical and apostolical tradition.'[1] Origen's teaching upon the Church is full and rich, and when he comments, for instance, on the red cord which marked Rahab's house for safety, he says with equal positiveness that there is no salvation except through the blood of Christ, and no salvation outside the Church.[2] Undoubtedly Clement and Origen alike endeavoured to mitigate this doctrine of exclusive salvation within the Church so as to bring it into harmony with God's universal purposes, with His recognised equity and good-will towards all, and with the universal presence of the Word to all men.[3] But with all this it is an undoubted truth that they did, like all the other Fathers, regard God's covenant in Christ as made with a visible society, membership in which was of universal obligation and alienation from which was death.

[1] *de Princip.* prooem. 2: 'Servetur vero ecclesiastica praedicatio per successionis ordinem ab apostolis tradita et usque ad praesens in ecclesiis permanens; illa sola credenda est veritas, quae in nullo ab ecclesiastica et apostolica discordat traditione.'

[2] *in Iesu Nave* hom. iii. 5: 'Sciebat etenim quia nulli esset salus nisi in sanguine Christi. . . . Si quis ergo salvari vult, veniat in hanc domum. . . . Ad hanc veniat domum in qua Christi sanguis in signo redemptionis est. . . . Nemo ergo sibi persuadeat, nemo semet ipsum decipiat: extra hanc domum, id est extra ecclesiam, nemo salvatur.' *in Matt.* xii. 11: ἥ τε ἐκκλησία, ὡς Χριστοῦ οἰκοδομή, τοῦ οἰκοδομήσαντος ἑαυτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν φρονίμως ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, ἀνεπίδεκτός ἐστι πυλῶν ᾅδου, κατισχυουσῶν μὲν παντὸς ἀνθρώπου τοῦ ἔξω τῆς πέτρας καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, οὐδὲν δὲ δυναμένων πρὸς αὐτήν. Cf. his interpretation of St. John i. 29: 'He taketh away the sin of the *world*,' i.e. 'the world of the Church,' the world within the world—the true κόσμος (*in Ioann.* vi. ad fin).

[3] E.g. (1) By generous recognition of the preparatory discipline of God all over the world leading up to the Incarnation: see above, pp. 15, 16.

(2) By drawing a distinction between different points of Christian belief; οἱ εἰς τὰ κυριώτατα παραπίπτοντες are distinguished from οἱ περὶ τῶν ἐν μέρει σφαλλόμενοι. Only the former are ψεῦσται τῷ ὄντι (Clem. *Strom.* vi. 15. 124). Cf. Origen *c. Cels.* v. 63.

(3) By distinguishing grades of salvation, and excluding virtuous disbelievers in Christ only from the highest *eternal life*. Origen *in Rom.* ii. 7: 'Iste licet alienus a vita videatur aeterna, quia non credit Christo, et intrare non possit in regnum caelorum, quia renatus non est ex aqua et Spiritu, videtur tamen quod per haec quae dicuntur ab apostolo bonorum operum gloriam et honorem et pacem perdere penitus non possit. . . . Sed tamen in arbitrio legentis sit, probare quae dicta sunt.'

The apologists—

Nor can it be really maintained that the more philosophic apologists of the second century were inclined 'to transform the Gospel into a monotheistic moral system.' It has been said that in the Apology of

Aristides.

the philosopher Aristides—presented to the Emperor Hadrian about A.D. 125, or perhaps to the Emperor Antoninus Pius about 140—'Christianity is exhibited as the most absolutely certain philosophy.'[1] But an important consideration is here left out of account. Christians are spoken of as constituting a new 'tribe' or 'race' of men; side by side with Greeks [and barbarians] and Hebrews are Christians.[2] The mere adherents of a philosophic school could not be so described; Christians can be (however liable the expression is to be misunderstood), because Christianity is essentially a society, a body.

Justin Martyr c. A.D. 150-160.

To Justin Martyr Christians are 'the genuine high-priestly race of God,' and the account of the sacraments which he gives the emperor in his Apology shows us how completely he conceived of

[1] Harnack *Contemp. Review* (Aug. 1886) p. 229. When Harnack wrote, and when the present book was first issued, our knowledge of Aristides was limited to the mention of his *Apology* in Eus. *H. E.* iv. 3 and to the fragments of two *Sermones S. Aristidis Philosophi* which had been edited from an early Armenian version, with a Latin translation, by the Mechitarist Fathers. Since then the *Apology* has become known to us in a Syriac version and, substantially, in the Greek original (*Texts and Studies* vol. i. no. 1, Cambridge, 1891): and we now see that the first *Sermo* was the opening of the *Apology*.

[2] The Armenian and Syriac texts (*Texts and Studies* i. pp. 32, 36) speak of *four* tribes or races of men. The original Greek perhaps read *three*: see *ib.* pp. 90, 100. The earlier *Preaching of Peter* described the Christians as a 'third race,' *ib.* p. 88: cf. Hadrian (if his letter to Servianus is genuine; on this see below p. 117 n.[3]): 'hunc [nummum] Christiani, hunc Iudaei, hunc omnes venerantur et gentes.' Cf. Melito's expression for the Christians—τὸ τῶν θεοσεβῶν γένος (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 26), and the same word in the *Ep. ad Diognet.* 1 καινὸν τοῦτο γένος ἢ ἐπιτήδευμα, also πολιτεία (*c.* 5), though the author is explaining that Christians remain members of their own different races and are not a people apart. Origen *c. Cels.* viii. 75: ἡμεῖς ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει ἄλλο σύστημα πατρίδος, κτισθὲν λόγῳ Θεοῦ, ἐπιστάμενοι. It becomes an expression of popular hatred against Christians that they are a genus tertium. See Tertull. *Scorp.* 10: 'Constitues et synagogas Iudaeorum, fontes persecutionum ... et populos nationum cum suo quidem circo ubi facile conclamant: Usque quo genus tertium?' *Ad Nat.* i. 8: 'Plane tertium genus dicimur ... recogitate ne quos tertium genus dicitis principem locum obtineant, siquidem non ulla gens non Christiana ... sed de superstitione tertium genus deputamur, non de natione, ut sint Romani, Iudaei, dehinc Christiani. Ubi autem Graeci ... ubi saltem Aegyptii?' For Justin see the next note.

Christianity as a *society*.[1] There is, again, no more beautiful description of the Church than that given by another apologist, Theophilus of Antioch, when he compares the 'holy churches' to fertile and well-inhabited islands in the sea, which have fair harbours of truth to welcome and give security to storm-tossed souls. 'To these they flee for refuge who wish to be saved, and who are lovers of the truth, wishing to escape the wrath and judgment of God.' And there are other islands, barren and dry and uninhabited save of wild beasts, on whose harbourless coasts ships are only wrecked, and these 'are the schools of error, that is of the heresies, which destroy those who visit them.'[2]

Theophilus c. A.D. 180.

Such being the Christian conception of their own body, it was inevitable that the world outside also should have regarded them as members of a society or brotherhood. As a matter of fact it was in this way that they became an object of suspicion. They seemed a sort of secret society, with an unintelligible 'freemasonry' of their own. Men suspected them of all sorts of secret iniquities. And all this was due to the closeness of their corporate life; they seemed a 'people of profane conspiracy,' 'a secret race, avoiding the light, silent in public, chattering in corners,' who 'recognised one another by secret marks and signs, and loved almost before they knew one another,'[3] calling one another by the suspicious name

The heathen idea of the Christians.

[1] *Apol.* i. 65; cf. *Dial.* 116 ἀρχιερατικὸν τὸ ἀληθινὸν γένος ἐσμὲν τοῦ θεοῦ, *ib.* 63 τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύουσιν, ὡς οὔσι μιᾷ ψυχῇ καὶ μιᾷ συναγωγῇ καὶ μιᾷ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

[2] Theophilus *ad Autolycum* ii. 14. In order to carry back the evidence of the Church conception to the earliest days outside the area of Christian history covered by the New Testament, it should be mentioned that the *Didache* conceives of Christians as constituting a visible society governed by a common law. The visible society, the Church, knit together by social sacraments (though these sacraments are conceived of in a judaic, meagre spirit), is the home of the revelation of knowledge and immortality given in Christ, and the antechamber to the final kingdom. Cf. x. 5: 'Remember Thy Church to deliver her from all evil and to perfect her in Thy love, and gather her from the four winds, the sanctified Church, into Thy kingdom which thou hast prepared for her': and ix. 4.

[3] This vivid picture is given in the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix, cc. 8, 9.

of 'brother.'[1] So, like any other guild or sodality, they appeared before the eyes of men as a body whose privileges were conditional on membership. Exact terms of membership were a special feature of contemporary guilds. Their members constituted a sort of republic apart.[2] Thus, though Christians might make public explanation of their rites and doctrines to avoid the misconceptions of the outside world, yet these rites and doctrines were admittedly the private property of their society, and no one could have the Christian's God for his father who had not the Christian's Church for his mother.

(2) The social form of Christianity not due to secular influence of the Collegia.

(2) But it has been suggested that Christianity owed its existence as a visible society to the fact that in the age when it spread there was a special tendency to association 'in the air.' Undoubtedly it was an age of guilds.[3] 'The need of association, of the strength which comes of association, was at least as great in antiquity as to-day; and among the peoples of antiquity it is the Romans, perhaps, who had the keenest sense of the need.'[4] The religious associations and trade guilds (sodalitates, collegia) were indeed ancient institutions at Rome. But the principle of association had received a great development, beginning with the later years of the Republic and under the early Empire. Thus every trade, every interest, came to have its collegium with its organization more or less elaborate, its officers, its specified terms of membership, its periodical feast. 'But it was not necessary, in order to form an association, to be members of the same profession, to be neighbours even, or compatriots; it was enough

[1] 'Sic nos, quod invidetis, fratres vocamus' (*Octav.* 31).

[2] See esp. Boissier (as quoted in the next paragraph) p. 261.

[3] See—an admirable account—Boissier *La Religion Romaine* bk. iii. ch. 3: Mommsen *de Collegiis et Sodaliciis Romanorum* (Kiel, 1843): Hatch *B. L.* p. 26 f.: Ramsay *Ch. in the Roman Empire*, index s.v. 'collegia.' My quotations are from Boissier.

[4] Boissier ii. p. 248.

to experience isolation or weakness, to feel the need of union to fight against misery or "ennui." This need was not rare, especially among the working classes.'[1] The tendency to use this freedom of association for purposes of political faction led to its being put under restraint.[2] No association might, under the empire, be formed without permission. But notwithstanding such prohibition, associations were formed and spread. 'They filled Rome, they spread to the smallest towns, they penetrated into the camps, they covered the richest provinces,' they honeycombed all ranks of society.[3] They existed—where the authority to repress should have been strongest—even in the army. Contemporaneously with the early spread of Christianity they developed largely as benefit clubs, especially for the purpose of burial—in part, because association in this form was allowed.[4] These burial guilds, in common with perhaps all collegia, had nominally a religious basis, even though the real purpose of association was of another sort.[5] With some of the associations the religious object, the promotion of some special cult, was the primary and real bond of union. This had been the case with the Greek guilds.[6] They came into existence (from the sixth century B.C. onward) partly under Semitic influence, to cultivate some special worship on a basis of voluntary initiation and by the primitive 'sacramental' method. In their developed form they had their terms of membership,

[1] Boissier ii. p. 260. [2] Hatch *B. L.* p. 27 n.[2]: Ramsay *op. cit.* pp. 215, 359.

[3] Boissier ii. p. 250. But the spread was unequal.

[4] This we know to have been the case in the first century. See Boissier ii. p. 280. The inscription from Lanuvium, which is the main evidence of this, is given at the end of Mommsen's *de Collegiis*, and with revised text in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* xiv. 2112. There were different classes of burial guilds, some not having the name collegium, but societas (Bossier ii. p. 272). Ramsay, pp. 359 n., 430, emphasizes the fact that these *collegia funeraticia*, to use the modern name, were properly *collegia tenuiorum*.

[5] Boissier ii. p. 268.

[6] θίασοι, ἔρανοι, ὀργεῶνες. See Foucart's *Les associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, and F. B. Jevons' *Introd. to Hist. of Religion* (Methuen, 1896) pp. 334 ff., 371.

their sacred book and 'immutable law,' their priests and officers, generally elected annually, and their assembly to pass decrees—each one a microcosm of the organization of a democratic state. These Greek guilds had been less influential, less respectable, and less prevalent than the Roman. However, they lasted on, and formed an element in that tendency to associate which (since the inscriptions have come to be studied) we know to have been a main characteristic of the otherwise somewhat monotonous life of the early empire.

Such was the character of the period in which Christianity spread. No doubt the Christian Church had obvious points of contact with these 'collegia.' It appears in the correspondence of Pliny and Trajan that the Christians of Bithynia came under the law against associations in virtue of their Sunday evening meetings for the social meal, which were consequently abandoned.[1] So far as associations were legal, on the other hand, Christians availed themselves of the law: 'the first form, in which any Christian body was recognised by the law, was as a benefit-club with special view to the interment of the dead.'[2] No doubt, again, the familiarity of the Greek and Roman world with incorporation into voluntary societies, having terms of membership, with privileges and the loss of them, greatly facilitated the spread of the Christian Church. It was thus an element in what we recognise as the 'divine preparation' for the spread of the

[1] Plinii *Epp.* x. 96, cf. Ramsay p. 219. Their morning meeting was purely religious, and consequently legal: 'the Roman Government expressly allowed to all people the right of meeting for purely religious purposes.'

[2] Lightfoot's *Ignatius* i. pp. 17-21. Ramsay thinks that in Phrygia the Christian churches *concealed themselves* under the guise of collegia, but that later on, when concealment was impossible and unnecessary, the fiction was kept up for the purpose of securing for the local communities, even while Christianity was held a capital offence, a legal position as Benefit Societies. See *Authority and Archæology* pp. 380 ff., *Ch. in Roman Empire* p. 436. The Jewish communities were also classed with the θίασοι; cf. Josephus *Ant. Iud.* xiv. x. 8: Γάϊος Καῖσαρ, ὁ ἡμέτερος στρατηγὸς καὶ ὕπατος, ἐν τῷ διατάγματι κωλύων θιάσους συνάγεσθαι κατὰ πόλιν, μόνους τούτους οὐκ ἐκώλυσεν οὔτε χρήματα συνεισφέρειν οὔτε συνδεῖπνα ποιεῖν.

Gospel; just as the Roman empire itself was another, and the general use of the Greek language, and the diffusion of the religion of the Jews through their dispersion, and the recognition in contemporary philosophy of the idea of the divine Reason or Word. But if the question be asked whether the influence of these contemporary guilds may not have modified the Christian religion in such a way as to be the cause of its assuming the form of an association or system of associations—the Church and the churches—the answer is a decisive negative.[1]

(*a*) No trace of such influence in Christian writers.

For, in the first place, any conception of real affinity between the Church and the collegia was, as the quotations above will have shown sufficiently, quite foreign to the minds of the Christian writers. Tertullian indeed suggests a *contrast* between them based on the fact that Christians, and they alone, mutually supported one another and had all things common; but there was no consciousness of resemblance.[2] Nothing in fact was less characteristic of the Christian Church than those natural features of all association which it shared with the guilds, nothing less expressed the sentiments of its members

[1] In some later developments Christianity may have borrowed in detail from contemporary clubs, e.g. the subdivision of monastic bodies into decuriae and centuriae probably (see Boissier ii. p. 264 with reference to Jerome's *Ep.* xxii.); again, some customs with reference to the dead and the use of the term memoria in this connexion (cf. μεμόριον, μεμορίτης), Boissier ii. p. 290. The term σύνοδος was used for the meetings of guildsmen: cf. σεμνοτάτη σύνοδος, Foucart p. 202, ἱερὰ σύνοδος (of an actors' guild with immoral reputation) Boissier ii. p. 267 f.: but so obvious a term can hardly be said to have been borrowed to express the meetings of bishops. Also ἐκκλησία, but (see p. 30 n.[3]) not in the Christian sense.

[2] The collegia were only very subordinately or slightly charitable associations (see Boissier i. pp. 302-304); the Greek ἔρανοι perhaps even less. 'Les Éranes,' says Foucart (p. 145), 'n'étaient pas des sociétés de secours mutuels.' See, however, Jevons *op. cit.* p. 336. Their stipes menstruae were contributions to benefit-clubs, not monthly alms; see Tertull. *Apol.* 39. The point of closest connexion between the Church and the guilds lay in the common meal; the 'love-feast' of the Christians had shown very early its affinities to the guild suppers (1 Cor. xi. 17 ff.). But St. Paul meets this danger by marking the essential difference in origin and aim of the 'Lord's Supper.' Historically, it was a development of the Paschal supper (St. Matt. xxvi. 17).

towards their 'mother.' 'The resemblances' between the Church and the collegia, says M. Boissier, 'are striking at the first glance; as soon as one approaches, the differences are apparent.'[1]

(*b*) Christian forms derived from Judaism.

Secondly, the nomenclature of the Christian communities suggests the minimum of connexion.[2] For in fact the Christian Church had its roots deep in Jewish soil. It derived from Judaism its characteristic nomenclature—that is to say, from a source much more ancient than the Roman empire or Greek society. The origin of the social form of Christianity is to be sought in the Jewish conception of the Messianic kingdom and in the deliberate intention of Him, who founded the Church, in claiming to be the Messiah.

(3) Witness of N. T. that Christ founded a visible Church.

(3) Does, then, the New Testament bear out the position that Christ appeared as the founder and organizer of a visible society? This question shall

[1] Boissier ii. p. 302. See also Loening *Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums* (Halle, 1889) pp. 9 ff., and Hort *The Christian Ecclesia* pp. 128-9.

[2] In the collegia and sodalicia we should hear of the album, or roll of members: the magistri: the quinquennales: the patroni: the gradus: the schola: the cena: the edituus: the quaestores. In the Greek ἔρανοι or θίασοι we should have the προστάτης, the ἄρχοντες, the ἐπιμελητής, the ζάκοροι, the ἱεροποιοί, the γραμματεύς, the ἀρχεραν-ιστής, the ταμίας, the τέμενος. What an alien atmosphere to this is suggested by the Christian nomenclature! It is the pagan Lucian who speaks of Peregrinus as θεασάρχης of the Christians.

The characteristic Christian terms are derived from Jewish use; e.g. ἐκκλησία has, primarily at least, the sense of the holy people as such, the Church, rather than the classical sense of the assembly, i.e. the people gathered together for a special purpose; and the former sense is based on Old Testament use. Dr. Hort (*The Christian Ecclesia* pp. 3 ff.) gives an account of the original meanings of the two Hebrew words קָהָל and עֵדָה and their LXX renderings ἐκκλησία and συναγωγή somewhat different from that which Trench (*N. T. Synonyms* p. 4) adopted from Vitringa. But at least after the Captivity the Hebrew קָהָל and the Greek ἐκκλησία had come to mean Israel or the sacred people (cf. Acts vii. 38), and it was in this sense that the word was adopted by our Lord. See Hort *op. cit.* pp. 10-11. Μυστήριον again has (at first) the Old Testament meaning of a divine secret communicated, rather than the pagan sense of a mystery of initiation. See Hatch *Biblical Greek* (Oxford, 1889) pp. 57-61. So βαπτισμός, εὐχαριστία, τράπεζα Κυρίου, ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν, ἐξομολόγησις, χρῖσμα, ἀδελφοί, καθέδρα, πρεσβύτερος, ποιμήν, προφήτης, εὐαγγελιστής, etc., are all terms of Jewish colouring. So perhaps is ἐπίσκοπος (see App. Note K). The prominent Christian functions and titles, except such as were substantially new, descend with the whole religious basis of Christianity from the Jewish stock.

be answered from the evidence of (*a*) the Gospels, (*β*) the Acts, (*γ*) St. Paul's Epistles.

(*a*) The question may be approached with less alarm because there is a remarkable unanimity among men of the keenest historical insight in seeing in Jesus one who above all things came to found a *society*, a *kingdom*. 'To deny,' says the author of *Ecce Homo*, 'that Christ did undertake to found and to legislate for a new theocratic society, and that he did claim the office of Judge of mankind, is indeed possible, but only to those who altogether deny the credibility of the extant biographies of Christ. If those biographies be admitted to be generally trustworthy, then Christ undertook to be what we have described; if not, then of course this, but also every other, account of him falls to the ground.' 'The city of God, of which the Stoics doubtfully and feebly spoke, was now set up before the eyes of men. It was no insubstantial city, such as we fancy in the clouds, no invisible pattern such as Plato thought might be laid up in heaven, but a visible corporation whose members met together to eat bread and drink wine, and into which they were initiated by bodily immersion in water.'[1] (a) Evidence of the Gospels.

There are three lines of evidence which seem to make the truth of this position clear:—

First, there is the method of Christ. Nothing is more remarkable than the refusal of Christ to commit Himself to men as He found them. There is something at first sight repellent in the solemn words of St. John: 'Jesus did not commit Himself (i) The method of Christ:

[1] *Ecce Homo* [18th ed.] pp. 39, 128. On this subject of Christ's institution of a visible Church, I should like to refer (among more recent writers) to Dean Church's *Advent Sermons* ii and iii, and his Oxford House Paper No. xvii; Dr. Stanton's *Jewish and Christian Messiah;* Bp. Westcott's Essay on 'The Two Empires' in his *Epp. of St. John*; Dr. Holland's *Creed and Character*; Dr. Milligan's *Resurrection of our Lord*, lect. vi, and Bp. Robertson's *Regnum Dei*, lect. ii. See also Archbishop Whately *Kingdom of Christ* Essay ii. init. and F. D. Maurice *Kingdom of Christ* i. p. 285 f. Among older English writers no one contends more powerfully for the church idea than William Law in his *Letters to the Bishop of Bangor*.

(to those who first believed in His name, when they saw the miracles), because He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, for He knew what was in man.'[1] That sad secret of human nature—its lamentable untrustworthiness—the secret which in slow, embittering experience has often turned enthusiasts into cynics and made philanthropists mad—Jesus knew it to start with. And, knowing it, He would not build His spiritual edifice on the shifting sands of such a humanity. It was not that He distrusted the capacity of human nature for the highest life. On the contrary, He came to proclaim the brotherhood of all men under the realized fatherhood of God—but not the brotherhood of men as they were. Except ye be converted, He said, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.[2] Man must have a fresh start: he must be built upon a fresh foundation: he must be regenerated, converted, if he is to be fit for sonship and for brotherhood. So Jesus Christ set Himself to give humanity a fresh start from a new centre, and that centre Himself. To do this He withdraws from the many upon the few. To the multitude He speaks in parables, 'that seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand.' Only a few, whom He sees capable of earnest self-sacrifice, of perseverance, of enlightenment, are gradually initiated into His secrets. These are 'the disciples.' These He trains with slow and patient care to appreciate His Person. From the most ready of these He elicits, after a time, by solemn questioning a formal confession of His Messiahship—a formal confession that He, the Son of Man, is also the Christ, the Son of the living God.[3] This thorough

[1] St. John ii. 23-25.
[2] St. Matt. xviii. 3; St. John iii. 5.
[3] St. Matt. xvi. 16.

recognition of His claim gives Him something to depend upon. He has got down to the rock; He can begin to build.[1] 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona; and I say unto thee that thou art Rock-Man, and on this rock (the rock of this human person acknowledging My divine Sonship and mission) I will build my new Israel.'[2] This gives us the clue to His method. All along Christ had had in view this foundation of the Church, and we see now what He had been waiting for. It was till He had won out of the hearts of His disciples that absolute devotion to His own Person, that complete acknowledgment of His claim, which would enable them to look away from all else and become the stable nucleus of a new society which was to represent His Name. Indeed, the more we study the Gospels, the more clearly we shall recognise that Christ did not cast His Gospel loose upon the world—the world which was so incapable of appreciating it; that would have been indeed to cast His pearls before swine; but He directed all His efforts to making a home for it, and that by organizing a band of men called 'out of the world' and consecrated into a holy unity, who were destined to draw others in time after them out of all ages and nations.[3] On this 'little flock' He fixed all His hopes. He prayed not for the world, but for those whom God had given Him out of the world. These in wonderful ways He meant to link to Himself in an indissoluble unity, as the branches to the vine, that they might live as an organized body in the world, yet distinct

[1] All the idea of this paragraph is admirably expressed in the sermon 'The Rock of the Church' in Holland *Creed and Character* pp. 46-49. 'Pity, infinite pity, He gave [the crowds]—but Himself He never gave; He could not commit Himself unto them. His work, His mission, His purpose on earth—how could they receive it? how could they understand it? . . . How can He build [the new house of God] on that loose and shifting rubble, on that blind movement of the crowd, so vague and so undetermined?'

[2] See Hort *Christian Ecclesia* p. 10.

[3] St. John xvii., and the whole of the last discourses.

from it—alive with His life, sanctified through His truth, enlightened by His Spirit. Christ then by His whole method declared His intention to found a Church, a visible society of men—which should be distinct from the world and independent of it, even while it should present before the eyes of all men the spectacle of what their common life might become.

(ii) His institution of social sacraments:

Secondly, the intention of Christ to found a social organization is apparent in the solemn ceremonies which He instituted as tokens of discipleship *as well as* channels of grace. The sacraments are *social* ceremonies. Baptism had formed part of the ceremony of initiating a proselyte into the Jewish Church. As used by John the Baptist, it had been in distinct relation to the coming of the Messianic kingdom. As adopted by Christ, it was no doubt meant to admit into the kingdom which had come, the Church of the new covenant.[1] And whatever possible ambiguity attends the conception of baptism in this respect, is removed by the other sacrament. The Eucharist is nothing if not social. Its whole natural basis as a common meal implies a community. Christ, then, in making baptism and the Eucharist the sacraments of His kingdom, just as in making love of the brethren *the* characteristic of His disciples, emphasized His intention to attach men to Himself not as individuals but as members of a brotherhood.

(iii) His claim to be the Messiah.

Lastly, and perhaps most profoundly, the intention of Christ to found a society is involved in His

Dr. Hatch calls this an 'unproved assumption' (*B. L.*[2] pref. p. xii). I should have thought that all possible doubt was set at rest by the parallel institution of the Eucharist. That at least is the sacrament of a society. But I cannot understand Dr. Hatch expressing a doubt that baptism had the social significance. It was never an *individual* purification amongst the Jews (see Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* i. pp. 272-274); it was always in connexion with the covenant which was with a *race*. The baptism of a Jewish proselyte was his incorporation with the race—'his new birth.' See Sabatier *La Didaché* p. 84 f. (an excellent passage on the relation of Christian to Jewish Baptism); Taylor *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* p. 55 f.; and Edersheim ii. app. xii (on the antiquity of the practice). Cf. also 1 Cor. x. 2.

whole claim to be the Messiah. The Messianic king of the Old Testament is the centre of a Messianic kingdom; the suffering Servant of Jehovah, by whose stripes men are healed, is no mere individual, but also the embodiment and representative of the chosen race.[1] Christ, then, when He came as the Messiah, brought the kingdom. 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand'—that is John the Baptist's message, that is the first word of Christ's preaching.[2] But in Him it was more than 'at hand.' It had come *upon* men and was among them.[3] John the Baptist had been outside it, but now there were those who were inside it, and who, though they were but little, were 'greater' than John the Baptist on that very account.[4] A kingdom which has thus a definite limit in time must be in some sense an outward institution and not a mere invisible idea or force. Christ had indeed to elevate the conceptions of His disciples so that they might understand its spiritual nature and object; but though it was spiritual, though it was not adapted to the carnal wants of the Jews, though it was not '*of* this world,' yet it was to be *in* the world—'a net to gather of every kind,' a visible society, that is, in which evil and good should be mixed.[5] Christ then

[1] Stanton *Jewish and Christian Messiah* p. 122 f.

[2] But only the *first* word, and then, too, with the addition given by St. Mark—πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός (Stanton *ib.* p. 218).

[3] St. Matt. xi. 11, 12, xii. 28; St. Luke xi. 20, xvi. 16, xvii. 21. In spite of Dalman *Worte Jesu* p. 119, and Dr. F. Field *Notes on Trans. of N. T.* (Camb. 1899) p. 71, I think ἐντὸς ὑμῶν may mean 'among' you. The kingdom of heaven, our Lord tells the Pharisees, is not to be found by close watching (παρατήρησις). It will not be manifest to those who wait merely on external observation. (Lo, here! or Lo, there!) For it has already passed your frontiers (cf. xi. 20 ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς) and is among you; see the two examples from Xenophon in Grimm-Thayer's Lexicon. But in the absence of similar examples in Greek more akin to St. Luke's this meaning cannot be pressed.

[4] St. Matt. xi. 11, 12.

[5] St. Matt. xiii. 47; cf. xxii. 2 (the Marriage of the King's Son). 'Let us suppose,' says William Law (*Letter* iii., near the beginning), 'that the Church of Christ was this invisible number of people united to Christ by such internal invisible graces; is it possible that a kingdom consisting of this one particular sort of people invisibly good should be like a net that gathers of every kind of fish?'

came to establish a 'kingdom of God' or a 'kingdom of heaven.'[1]

Some modern scholars[2] have reached the conclusion that this expression in our Lord's mouth must have signified 'divine rule' rather than 'a divinely governed state.' But it certainly meant that the prophetic ideal of the Old Testament was being realized, and that ideal certainly included a human society governed and indwelt by God. Moreover, no idea less concrete than this can really satisfy either the Gospel expressions already referred to, or others in which the Church—Christ's reformed Israel—is practically identified with the kingdom of heaven.[3] It is only because the Church is both a human organization and a divine kingdom that a divine sanction can attach to its legislative and judicial decisions: that what it binds or looses on earth is bound or loosed in heaven, and whose sins it forgives are forgiven, whose sins it retains are retained.

(The relation of the Church to the kingdom of God.)

Is then Christ's new society, the Church, simply identical with the kingdom of heaven? To answer this question a distinction must be drawn in view of the double sense in which the kingdom is said to come. In one sense the kingdom is already come; that is, it is established in spiritual power and all its forces are at work. But, as St. Augustin has expressed it, 'non adhuc regnat hoc regnum'; for it has yet to grow like the mustard-seed, to work its way like the leaven through all the institutions of the world, it has yet to bear its universal witness 'to all the nations'; only so at last can the kingdom come in glory. Thus in one sense the kingdom already exists, in another sense it has yet to

[1] The expressions appear to mean the same thing. 'Heaven' is God less personally conceived: see St. Matt. xxi. 25, St. Luke xv. 18; and cf. Robertson *Regnum Dei* p. 63.

[2] See Robertson, p. 59, following Dalman, and cf. Sanday in Hastings' *Dict. of Bible* ii. pp. 619 ff.

[3] St. Matt. xvi. 19, xviii. 17-20; St. John xx. 22, 23.

appear.[1] In this latter sense, then, the Church prepares for the kingdom rather than *is* it.[2] But in the first sense, though the 'kingdom of God' remains a less definite and concrete term than 'the Church,' yet the Church can be so far identified with the 'kingdom' that St. Peter, as the Church's future steward, receives the promise of 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven'—the power, that is, by admitting to the Church and excluding from it, to admit men to or exclude them from the kingdom of God.

Christ, then, according to the evidence of the Gospels, founded a community of men, a Church, to be the depository of the gospel which He came to bring, to be the household in which His stewards should dispense the food of God until He should come again;[3] and in the great forty days, when He spoke to His disciples of the things concerning the kingdom of God, He spoke to them as the first representatives of that visible society which was to be at least its earthly counterpart.

(The Church not exclusive.)

We must not suppose that the institution by Christ of a Church with a definite limit and an exclusive

[1] All this is expressed in the double use of all the characteristic Gospel terms, as (1) of things already being enjoyed; (2) of things hoped for. We *are* sons, yet we 'wait for the adoption'; we *are* redeemed, yet we wait for 'the redemption of our bodies'; we *are* saved, yet only in the future will 'our salvation draw nigh,' it is now only 'nearer than when we believed.' Here in fact the kingdom is in power—not in glory or final fulfilment. But it is because the present Church is a simple anticipation of the Church as it is to be—the same society at an earlier stage—that even now it is called 'heavenly.' We have been 'made to sit in heavenly places': we have 'tasted the powers of the world to come': the institutions of the Church are 'the heavenly things': and we '*are come* unto the heavenly Jerusalem' (Eph. i. 3, ii. 6; Heb. vi. 5, ix. 23, xii. 22).

[2] Cf. *Didache* ix. 4: 'Let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom.' Clem. *ad Cor.* 42: οἱ ἀπόστολοι . . . ἐξῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ μέλλειν ἔρχεσθαι. Cf. Church's *Advent Sermons* p. 70: the Kingdom of God 'has its witness, its representative in the universal Church of Christ. Nothing can be an adequate representation of that invisible kingdom of God; it extends, even on earth, beyond even the bounds of the universal Church. But His Church is the designated and appointed recognition of His kingdom.' *Ib.* p. 72: the Church is 'the religious body which He has called into being, to be the shadow and instrument of His kingdom.'

[3] St. Luke xii. 42, 43.

claim is a narrowing of His love.[1] The claim which the Church makes on every man simply corresponds to his moral needs as Christ interprets them. It is because He loves all that He established a *Civitas Dei*, wide enough for all, in order to their spiritual recovery. The Church would indeed represent a narrowing of the divine love if any were by Christ's will excluded from it. But it is open to all. And as there are those to whom 'the gospel of the kingdom' has never come, or never come with its true appeal, so we are assured that God's purpose is larger than His Church on earth.[2] There are 'last' in the knowledge of God here and now who shall be 'first' in His final acceptance, because they practised all they knew.

(β) Evidence of the Acts.

(β) When Christ speaks to St. Peter of the foundation of the Church, it is still in the future. The Church only receives its commission to all nations after His Resurrection. It comes into actual corporate life only with the Pentecostal gift. Thus the Church goes forth for the first time in the Acts of the Apostles as a visible community, vitalized by Christ's Spirit, to be the representative on earth of the risen and ascended Lord.[3]

[1] See Holland *Creed and Character* sermon iv. 'The Secret of the Church,' esp. pp. 59, 60. 'God's love in Christ *found itself limited*. . . . How? Not by the Church, but by the crowd, by the block o fblind and heedless ignorance.'

[2] See esp. St. Matt. xxv. 31 f. Cf. Dr. Pusey's *Responsibility of Intellect in Matters of Faith* p. 44 [ed. 1879]: 'In those ever open portals there enter that countless multitude whom the Church knew not how to win . . . or, alas! neglected to win them. . . . In whatever hatred, or contempt, or blasphemy of Christ nurtured, God has His own elect, who ignorantly worship Him, whose ignorant fear or longing He Who inspired it will accept.'

[3] 'To [the Church] alone,' says Prof. Milligan (*Resurrection of our Lord*, second edition, p. 218), 'as the representative of the Risen Lord, is the power entrusted by which [His] work may be successfully accomplished. We know that this can be done by no other means than the agency of the Spirit; and it would seem that the gift of the Spirit is bestowed only through the Church as the organ upon earth of the Risen and Glorified Lord in heaven. We dare not indeed restrain the power of the Almighty; but what we have to do with is His *plan*; and of that plan what has now been said appears to be one of the most striking characteristics. . . . It appears to be the teaching of the New Testament that, as it is the prerogative of Christ in His glorified humanity to bestow the Spirit, so it is only

That Christianity in the Acts is represented by a community, there can surely be no doubt. The souls 'who were added' at Jerusalem 'continued steadfast in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship.' They were members of a society more or less organized. They had all things common. Salvation was in the community; 'the Lord added into one, day by day, those who were being saved.'[1] As the new religion spread over Galilee and Samaria it was still 'the Church.'[2] 'The Church' at Antioch, where Christians got their new name,[3] is the same society extending itself to a new city. So when St. Paul went abroad, he founded 'churches' to prepare men for the kingdom.[4] And the local churches are but branches of one stock. Behind the churches is *the Church* represented by the Apostles. This is the truth which is impressed on the narrative of the Apostolic Conference with its authoritative direction to the churches—'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things.'[5] This is only the exhibition in act of the authority given by Jesus Christ to His society over its members, to bind and to loose with heavenly sanction.

(γ) Evidence of St. Paul's Epistles.

(γ) The picture presented in the Acts is the same as that of which we become spectators in St. Paul's Epistles. He writes to 'the Church of God which is at Corinth,' and that church is undoubtedly a

through the Church, as the representative of that glorified humanity, that the influences of the Spirit are communicated to the world.' He emphasizes earlier (p. 204) the ***visible unity*** which the Church was meant to have as the representative of the Risen Christ.

[1] Acts ii. 41-47.

[2] Acts ix. 31: 'The Church through the whole of Judaea and Galilee and Samaria had peace.' Occasionally of course a convert, like the Ethiopian eunuch, might belong to other countries.

[3] Acts xiii. 1; xi. 26. On the significance of the exact form Christiani see Simcox's *Early Church History* p. 62: on the analogy of Herodiani, Pompeiani, etc., it suggests, not the disciples of a school, but the adherents of a leader or king.

[4] Acts xiv. 22, 23; xv. 41; xvi. 5.

[5] Acts xv. 28.

visible body containing good and bad members alike. It is a 'temple of God,' but a temple which sin can corrupt;[1] a chosen people, but one like that of the old covenant, capable of like failure;[2] it is the 'body of Christ' through sacramental participation in His life, but there may be 'schism in the body.'[3] St. Paul then conceives of the local church as a visible community of mixed character, but with unmistakable limits. The distinction between 'those within' and 'those without' is very marked.[4] But each local church is only one representative of *the Church* which is general. St. Paul governs each particular church in accordance with the evangelical tradition of truth and life, which is common to all and to which he is himself subject.[5] He passes back imperceptibly, without any break in thought, from the churches to the Church;[6] the Church in fact simply (as far as this world is concerned) *consists of* the churches. Thus, when in the Epistle to the Ephesians he is drawing out the spiritual significance of the Church as 'the body of Christ, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all'—when he is declaring it to be one, in virtue alike of the one life which it derives from Christ by the communication of the Spirit, and of the one truth which 'apostles and prophets' delivered from Christ, and of the love in which it must bind both Jews and Gentiles in one[7]

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 17. [2] 1 Cor. x. 1-13.

[3] 1 Cor. x. 16; xii. 12-28. It is of course plain why the *imperfections* of the Church are dwelt on in connexion with the local societies: they are naturally matters of specially local concern and local treatment.

[4] 1 Cor. v. 9-13; cf. xiv. 23; 2 Cor. vi. 14 f. Of course the brethren at a particular place, as at Rome when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to 'the saints' there, may not yet have been completely organized into a local church. That was, as it is now, a work of time. But a Christian, as such, is a member of the *Christian society*, and, unless in exceptional circumstances, of an organized local church.

[5] 1 Cor. xi. 2 'The traditions'; 1 Cor. xv. 3; 2 Thess. iii. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 17 'So ordain I in all the Churches'; Gal. i. 7, 8 'Though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any other gospel . . . let him be anathema.'

[6] 1 Cor. xii. 28, xv. 9; Gal. i. 13.

[7] Eph. iv. 3-16: it is 'one body' in virtue of the 'one Spirit' whose indwelling is Christ's indwelling; owns 'one Lord' in the power of 'one faith' and the consecra-

—he is indeed describing the Christian society 'from an ideal point of view'; that is to say, he is describing all that the Church potentially is, as when we too proclaim the Church 'one, holy, and catholic':[1] nevertheless it is the visible, actual Church of which he is speaking,[2] the Church to which Christ gave visible officers, 'some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers,' for the full equipment of the Church with a view to what it is to do and what it is to become. This visible hierarchy belongs plainly to a visible society—exactly that same society which St. Paul similarly describes in his Epistle to the Corinthians as 'the body of Christ,' even as part of Christ,[3] the Church in which 'God set first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers,'[4] that is the general community which is locally represented in the churches of Corinth and Ephesus.[5] St. Paul then means by the Church a

tion of one baptism; and it knows no God and Father but one. It *ought to live*, therefore, in the unity of love (ver. 3): to maintain the 'bond of peace' is a duty which men may ignore, but the inward unity of life, though dependent on onward facts (e.g. 'one baptism'), is a reality, whether recognised in practice or not.

[1] The Church has never yet so developed all the fulness within her as to exhibit herself in her full catholic glory and holiness as the 'bride of Christ.' She is potentially more than she is actually. Potentially catholic, for example, she still leaves outside her fold the mass of Oriental peoples.

[2] See Pfleiderer's account of the Epistle to the Ephesians (*Paulinism* ii. pp. 190-193) and Hort's *Ecclesia* p. 169; and my own *Ephesians* pp. 140 ff.

[3] 'The Christ' consists of the head and the members (1 Cor. xii. 12).

[4] 1 Cor. xii. 27-28. This passage (vv. 12-28) about the body of Christ, taken with such passages as Gal. iii. 27 ('baptized into Christ') and 1 Cor. x. 16, 17 (about the Eucharist), seems to me to contain all the truth that is developed in the Epistle to the Ephesians; nor can I see that there is anything in the expression 'the Church, the pillar and ground (or "a pillar and stay") of the truth' (1 Tim. iii. 15), which might not have occurred in the Epistle to the Ephesians or in that to the Corinthians.

[5] Dr. Hatch calls it 'an unproved assumption' that 'the Church of which St. Paul speaks as the body of Christ, "the fulness of Him which filleth all in all," is really, as the Augustinian theory assumes it to be, a visible society or aggregation of societies' (*B. L.*[2] pref. p. xii). His view appears to coincide with that of Bishop Hoadly, who was Law's opponent. The Bishop held 'as the only true account of the Church of Christ,' in general, that it was 'the number of men, whether small or great,' who were sincere Christians—i.e. the invisible society of the elect. This, he held, is what St. Paul calls *the Church*. 'Can it be supposed,' he pleads, 'that a man's being of the Invisible Church of Christ is inconsistent with his joining himself with any Visible Church?' but the first is essential, the second is voluntary. Law deals with trenchant power with this utterly unscriptural distinction between the 'universal invisible' and 'particular visible' Churches (*Letter* iii. section 1 'Of the Nature of the Church').

society as visible as the churches which represent it.

This doctrine of the Church not inconsistent with justification by faith:

It is sometimes argued that St. Paul could not have believed in salvation through the Church, because this contradicts his doctrine of the justifying effect of individual faith.[1] But in fact there is no such contradiction. The Christian life is a correspondence between the grace communicated from without and the inward faith which, justifying us before God, opens out the avenues of communication between man and God, and enables man to appropriate and to use the grace which he receives in Christ. There is thus no *antagonism*, though there is a *distinction*, between grace and faith. Now grace comes to Christians through *social* sacraments, as members of one 'Spirit-bearing body.' 'By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body'; 'we being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread.'[2] Thus the doctrine of the Church as the household of grace is the complement, not the contradiction, of the doctrine of faith. Faith is no faith if it isolates a man from the fellowship of the one body, and the one body has no salvation except for the sons of faith. Ignatius then with his strenuous insistence on churchmanship can rightly, so far, 'claim to be a good Paulinist.'[3] In fact St. Paul's teaching about the Church is given nowhere with more practical force than in the Epistles to the Corinthians, which belong to that very group of Epistles in which he fights the battle of faith. And both principles are brought into play by him to vindicate against Judaism the catholicity of the Gospel. Christianity is a catholic religion, he argues in his earlier Epistles, because it appeals to a faculty as universal as human nature—the faculty of

[1] Pfleiderer *Hibbert Lectures* lecture vi.
[2] 1 Cor. xii. 13, x. 17.
[3] Pfleiderer *op. cit.* p. 262; Ignatius *ad Philad.* 8.

faith: men are justified by nothing of national or local observance like the Law; 'it is one God who will justify the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision through faith.'[1] Christianity is catholic, he argues again in effect, in the Epistles of the first captivity, because the Person of Christ is a catholic, a universal Personality; 'by Him were all things created—by Him and for Him—and in Him all things have their consistence.'[2] Therefore also His redemptive power transcends all local, national distinctions; 'He hath made both (Jews and Gentiles) one . . . in one body.'[3] For the unity of that body, in which on the basis of faith the Gospel offers sanctification to mankind, is by its very essence as the body of Christ universal in its capacity. But these two grounds of catholicity are correlative, not antagonistic.

nor with the 'freedom of the spirit':

Once again, if there be such a thing as liberty in law or a 'law of liberty,'[4] the obligations of church membership and the authority of a common rule of truth are not in any way antagonistic to the freedom of the spirit. The good citizen, whether of the earthly or heavenly city, is free *in* the law by being at one with the spirit of the law. Here again the same St. Paul held to both sides of the antithesis which is represented by authority and freedom, by fellowship and individuality.

but agreeable to the principle of all human society.

The doctrine of the Church is indeed only one expression of a principle as broad as human society —the principle that man realizes his true self only by relation to a community, that 'he is what he is only as a member of society.' Aristotle said of old that 'the society (the city) is prior to the individual' —prior, that is, in idea, because it is essential to his being really man, because man is by his very essence

[1] Rom. iii. 30.
[2] Col. i. 16, 17.
[3] Eph. ii. 14-16.
[4] St. James i. 25.

'a social animal.'[1] By isolating himself he hinders, he narrows himself, he perishes: by merging himself in the larger whole he realizes his true individuality and his true freedom. So when God sent redemption upon the earth, He sent it in a community or kingdom. Fellowship with God is to be won through fellowship with His Son, but that not otherwise than through fellowship with His Church. 'That ye may have fellowship *with us*'—that is why St. John writes his Epistle[2]—'and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.' Nor are we to suppose that this association is only a temporary and painful expedient—that we are to submit to be one body for a while in order to live a more separate and isolated life hereafter. No, as the life of perfected humanity[3] is presented to us in the vision of the Apocalypse, it is the life of a City indissolubly one. It is the life of the one bride of Christ, the one humanity, whose white robes are the distinctive, yet coincident, 'righteousnesses of the saints.'[4]

Two misconceptions of the growth of the Church.

Now that we have brought this investigation to a conclusion, we are in a position to repudiate two ways of conceiving the development of Christianity.

(1) That it developed out of previous individualism,

(1) It has been represented[5] as if at the first stage we must conceive of Christians rather as individual believers who were led to unite in local associations. This is accounted for by the 'tendency to association,' characteristic of the Roman empire of that date. But association was not at first a 'fixed

[1] On the Greek idea of the πόλις see Newman *Politics of Aristotle* i. p. 560: 'a strongly individualized unity which impresses its dominant idea on its members,' etc.

[2] 1 St. John i. 3. 'Manifeste ostendit B. Iohannes quia quicumque societatem cum Deo habere desiderant primo ecclesiae societati debent adunari' (Bede, quoted by Westcott *in loc.*).

[3] I am not wishing to deny that St. John is representing the Church as she now is: cf. Milligan *The Revelation of St. John* p. 228. But it is certainly a picture of what she will not only be, but *be wholly and manifestly*, hereafter.

[4] Rev. xix. 8.

[5] By Dr. Hatch (*B. L.* p. 29 f.), if I understand him rightly. Dr. Sanday interprets him otherwise (*Expositor*, Jan. 1887, p. 10 n.[1]).

habit'; it was not 'universally recognised as a primary duty'; it did not 'invariably follow belief.' Afterwards the local associations succeed in so asserting themselves over individual Christians that adhesion to a community ceases to be voluntary; a man is no Christian unless he belongs to one. This is the state of things which the Ignatian letters are intended to promote. Still, however, Christians might be supposed to unite in Churches how and where they pleased. But later this 'free right of association' vanishes;[1] each Church with its bishop and presbytery asserts itself as the exclusive local 'ark of the covenant.' All who would be within the pale must belong to this one and none other. This is the successful contention of Cyprian. Still later these authoritative local Churches grow into closer and closer combination. The idea of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith, due to St. Irenaeus,[2] had already formed a bond of union under a common authoritative Creed: now the churches become one great confederation of societies in a unity which found expression in ecumenical councils with their common authority.[3] Gradually, meanwhile, the hierarchical gradations amongst the various bishops develop on the lines of the imperial system.

—a theory contrary to the evidence.

Now this mode of conceiving the progress of Christianity is in direct violation of the evidence. The only evidence produced for the supposed first stage which preceded obligatory association consists in the fact that the earliest church teachers found it necessary to preach the duty of association, 'if not as an article of the Christian faith, at least as an element of Christian practice.'[4] This is evidenced by the warning in the Epistle to the Hebrews against forsaking the Christian assemblies;[5] by St.

[1] Hatch *B. L.* pp. 103-106.
[2] *Ib.* p. 96: 'Its first elaboration and setting forth was due to one man's genius.'
[3] *Ib.* pp. 97, 175-189. [4] *Ib.* p. 29. [5] Hebrews x. 25.

Jude's denunciation of those who 'separate themselves';[1] by the passages in the Shepherd of Hermas[2] about those who 'have separated themselves' and so 'lose their own souls.' What do such utterances really go to prove? A tendency to slackness on the part of *those who had been Christians*[3] and as such had hitherto frequented the assemblies of the Church—a sin of schism, denounced like any other sin. But the idea is nowhere discernible that every Christian was not, as such, a member of the Church, bound to the obligations of membership.[4] Schism is a sin in Scripture[5] as really as in Ignatius' letters. Next, the supposed right of free association into churches never existed. No doubt the tendency to association in the Roman empire made (as has been said) for the spread of the Christian Church. It made the idea of a Church easier to men's minds. But more than this the facts of the case will not allow us to grant. Christ Himself constituted the Church and gave it its authority, so that it came upon men as a divine gift, with a divine claim, through the apostolic preaching. 'Jesus,' says Dr. Stanton, 'never speaks of the kingdom as something which men could constitute for themselves; it must come to them.'[6] From the beginning of Christianity it came to men and took them up, one by one, out of their isolation and alienation from God into its holy and blessed fellowship. It was never a creation of their own by free association. The idea is a figment. From the first each local church with its organization represented the divine will for man's salvation in one

[1] St. Jude 19. [2] See above pp. 18-19.

[3] That they *had been members of the Church* is quite plain in the passages quoted from Hermas.

[4] Of course he might find himself in an isolated position away from church privileges, as may happen to-day.

[5] The 'heretic' is the man of self-willed, separatist tendencies (Tit. iii. 10). Cf. St. Jude 19; St. Matt. xviii. 17.

[6] *Jewish and Christian Messiah* p. 218.

body. Those who would share what Christ came to give must be added to it. Once added to it, they cannot but remain in it, dutiful children of the divine mother, loyal citizens of the city of the saints. Thus Cyprian's vigorous condemnation of schismatics who broke off from the Church at Carthage or in Rome involved no new principle at all,[1] nothing that was not implied in Ignatius' cry—'one Eucharist, one altar, one bishop'[2]—or in Clement of Rome's remonstrance with the schismatical party at Corinth. Nor was the Catholic Apostolic Faith an idea originated or substantially developed by Irenaeus, though he gave it a new and powerful application. Irenaeus is anything rather than a genius who originates. This idea of the universal authoritative tradition of the Christian faith, as it made possible in a later epoch the general councils, as it inspired Clement in Alexandria quite as much as Irenaeus in the West, so in earlier days it made possible the 'Catholic Epistles,'[3] and was present in the Church since men first rallied to the apostolic doctrine. Whatever development there was, then, from the day of Pentecost till the Council of Chalcedon did not touch the truth of the visible Church or aggregation of churches, which it always presupposed, nor the corresponding obligation of membership in it: it presupposed the doctrine of the visible Church with its threefold unity in the life which it derived from its Head, Christ, in the truth of the apostolic tradition, and in the fellowship and intercourse of love.

(2) That the Church idea was a Roman development:

(2) It remains to point out that this idea of the Church, known as Catholicism, was not the creation of western influences and cannot historically be

[1] The Eastern Churches which were at first inclined to accept Novatian would have accepted him as *the bishop of Rome*, not as one among a number. The question was simply who was the bishop. See further in chap. III. p. 151 n[3].

[2] *ad Philad.* 4.

[3] Harnack *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel* (*Texte u. Untersuch.* ii. Band, Heft 2) p. 105.

identified (as is sometimes[1] done) with Romanism. Was there, then, nothing new in that western conception of the Church which was finally expressed in the mediaeval papacy? Novelty there undoubtedly was, but it was not in any sense the doctrine of the visible Church. What then do the facts of history allow us to describe as Catholicism and what as Romanism?

but there is an original doctrine of the visible Church

Church unity in the New Testament is expressed primarily in such metaphors as those of the body of Christ or the Vine with its branches. What primarily constitutes the unity of the Church is the life of Christ derived to its members by His Spirit. The Church is one on account of the spiritual presence which makes her the temple of God or the 'Christ-bearer.' None the less the Church is an external reality, a visible society; for the principle of the Incarnation, which governs the Church, links the inward to the outward, the spiritual to the material —there is 'one body' as well as 'one Spirit.' Spiritual gifts are given by sacraments, and sacraments are visible and social ceremonies of incorporation, or benediction, or feeding. Thus the Christian's spiritual privileges depend on membership of a visible society; but the visible society exists not as an instrument of external secular authority, but as the divine home of spiritual edification, for the 'building up of the body of Christ,' for the 'perfecting' of man 'into one'—into the unity of the life of God.[2] Therefore

[1] See for this idea, in a curiously unhistorical shape, Allen's *Continuity of Christian Thought* pp. 100-105. Cf. Harnack's *Dogmengesch.* i. pp. 362-371 [ed.[4], 1909, pp. 480-496] (Katholisch u. Römisch); also Renan's *Hibbert Lectures*. The latter assumes in support of his theory that St. Luke's writings (p. 132), the 'Preaching of Peter'—the basis of the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions (p. 134)—and probably the Pastoral Epistles (p. 163), derive from the Roman Church and represent its ideas. At least the Pastoral Epistles, like the Ignatian (p. 170), exhibit what is characteristically the Roman temper!

[2] St. John xvii. 23; St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians iv. 13 εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον: see also on the *Shepherd of Hermas*, above p. 17. It is characteristic of the scriptural and fundamental idea of church unity that it should be a progressive thing, progressing with a spiritual advance; not an external thing once for all imposed. The

the instrument of unity is the Spirit; the basis of the unity is Christ, the Mediator; the centre of the unity is in the heavens, where the Church's exalted Head lives in eternal majesty—human, yet glorified. If it be the case, as Ignatius taught (and of course that is still an open question in this discussion), that a bishop is an essential element of the organization of each visible church, then he will be the centre and symbol of local unity; but, as the local church exists only in order to bring men into relation to Christ and to the redeemed humanity which Christ is gathering to Himself in the unseen world, so the catholic Church, the society which each local church represents, has its centre of unity in Christ.[1] Only (so to speak) the lower limbs of the body of Christ are on earth. The Church is a society in the world, but not *wholly* in the world, nor existing for the world's ends. Thus the primary importance of its organization is *local*. Each local church exists to keep open (so to speak) the connexion of earth and heaven; to keep the streams of the water of life flowing; to maintain and teach and protect the creed which moulds the Christian character. Of course the Christian churches have a necessary relation to one another. They constitute together one body; they maintain one tradition, and the test of it is found in their consent; they exhibited, they ought still to exhibit, an unbroken fellowship. At the same time each has a relative independence,[2] for the authority over all is that of a common tradition, of which the witness lies in the general consent (as expressed most fully in a general council), coupled with the canon of

unity of the Church becomes constantly closer as the barriers which sin interposes between man and God, and so between man and his fellows, are removed. Sin, on the other hand, tends to mar the unity by 'schisms' which may be more or less pronounced.

[1] See the passage from Ignatius quoted before (p. 20) with Bp. Lightfoot's comment.

[2] As St. Cyprian emphasized. See in chap. III. p. 155.

Scripture.[1] Such is the conception of the Church as existing for the ends of 'grace and truth,' which can be justly described as Catholic.[2]

distinct from the Roman modification of it.

Enough has been said to enable us to indicate by contrast what may historically be called its *Roman* development. The scriptural and catholic conception admitted of development—in this sense, that, saving the original principle, the relations between the different churches admitted of elaboration as facilities for communication increased under imperial recognition, or as the authority of the common tradition was forced into prominence by the disintegrating effects of Gnosticism and other heresies. But the Roman development gave a new colour to the idea of the Church, not indeed by the introduction of any wholly novel element, but by distorting the idea of its function and unity. It has been already noticed how the Roman Church inherited the imperial conceptions of empire and government. The injunction—

> 'Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento. . . .
> Parcere subiectis et debellare superbos'—

might have been spoken to the popes as well as to the emperors. At Rome, then, to a slight extent perhaps even from Victor's days—to a more palpable extent from the latter part of the fourth century, the idea of the Church becomes in a measure secularized. The

[1] So the rule of faith is formulated by Irenaeus, I. x 1, 2, and III. i-v, Tertull. *de Praescr.* 27-36, Vincent. *Commonit.* 2, 9, 20, 23, 29.

[2] On this conception of the Church see a typical passage in St. Augustin *Enarr. in Psalm.* Ps. lvi. 1: 'Quoniam totus Christus caput est et corpus . . . caput est ipse salvator noster, passus sub Pontio Pilato, qui nunc, postea quam resurrexit a mortuis, sedet ad dexteram Patris: corpus autem eius est ecclesia; non ista aut illa, sed toto orbe diffusa; nec ea quae nunc est in hominibus qui praesentem vitam agunt, sed ad eam pertinentibus etiam his qui fuerunt ante nos et his qui futuri sunt post nos usque in finem saeculi. Tota enim ecclesia constans ex omnibus fidelibus, quia fideles omnes membra sunt Christi, habet illud caput positum in caelis quod gubernat corpus suum; etsi separatum est visione, sed annectitur caritate.' Cf. the excellent account of the Church in Dr. Mason's *The Faith of the Gospel* ch. vii. §§ 9, 10 and ch. viii.

Church becomes a great world-empire for purposes of spiritual government and administration. The primary conception of her unity becomes that of *unity of government*, the sort of unity which most readily submits itself to secular tests and most naturally postulates a visible centre and head: the dominant idea becomes that of authority. All the needs of the early mediaeval period tended to add strength to this tendency, for what the world wanted was above all things order, discipline, rule. Thus the conception of government tends to overshadow earlier conceptions of the Church's function even in relation to the truth. Compare the Roman Leo's view of the truth with that of the Alexandrian Didymus or Athanasius, and the contrast is marked. Both the western and eastern writers insist equally on the truth of the Church dogma; but to the eastern it is the guide to the knowledge of God, to the western it is the instrument of authority and of discipline. Once again, the over-authoritativeness of tone which becomes characteristic of the Roman Church makes her impatient of the more slow and laborious and complex methods of arriving at the truth on disputed questions which belonged to the earlier idea of the 'rule of faith.' The comparison of traditions, the elaborate appeal to Scripture, these methods are too slow and sometimes (as the revelation in this world is incomplete [1]) yield no decisive result: something is wanted more rapid, more imperious. It is no longer enough to conceive of the Church as the catholic witness to the faith once for all delivered. She must be the living voice of God, the oracle of the divine will. Now, as the strength and security of witness lies in the consent of independent testimonies, so the strength of authoritative, oracular utterance lies in unimpeded, unqualified centrality, and Christendom

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 9-12.

is found to need a central shrine where divine authority shall speak.

Thus two different ideas of the Church's function find expression in the general councils and in the papacy; and at least a differently balanced idea of the function of the episcopate finds expression in the catholic conception of the bishop as securing the channels of grace and truth and representing the divine presence, and in the Roman conception of an external hierarchy of government centering in the papacy. The conflict between the two conceptions begins perhaps even in the days of Victor or Stephen; it bears fruit in the Great Schism and in the further schisms of the Reformation.[1] Of course the Roman doctrine of church unity does not *annihilate* the other and older conception. The bishop remains still in the Roman Church what he was from the beginning, but another idea has been superadded, and it is this superadded idea which differentiates the Romanized from the primitive and undivided Church. With this superadded conception we shall not be further concerned in this argument. We have only to do with the fundamental doctrine of the visible Church as the body of Christ, which is inseparably associated with the doctrine of the faith and the sacraments, and which we are now in a position to assume was a conception held from the first, running up for its primary authority to the will of Christ the King.

[1] It is not suggested that the Roman claims were more than one among several causes of these schisms.

[On the whole subject of chapter I. reference should be made to Dr. Mason's essay 'Conceptions of the Church in early times' in *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry* (Macmillan, 1918).]

CHAPTER II

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

JESUS CHRIST, we are now in a position to assume, founded a visible society, which, as embodying God's new covenant with men and representing His good-will towards them, was intended to embrace all mankind. As that society has existed in history, it has exhibited a more or less broad and marked distinction between clergy and laity, priests and people, pastors and their flocks. Such a distinction would, it may be argued, inevitably grow up on the same principles which regulate the division of labour in other departments of human life. The question then arises: Is the Christian ministry simply, like a police force, a body which it has been found advantageous to organize and may be found advantageous to reorganize? Did Christ in instituting His society leave it to itself to find out its need of a differentiation of functions and develop a ministry, or did He, on the other hand, when He constituted His society, constitute its ministry also in the germ? Did He establish not only a body, but an organized body, with a differentiation of functions impressed upon it from the beginning?

Did Christ institute a ministry?

It may be urged that the former alternative is more in accordance with what we should expect,[1] for it will exhibit the Christian ministry as of a piece with the ordinary products of social evolution. Such a presumption might be met in a measure,

The idea not improbable;

[1] As by Hatch *B. L.*[2] pp. 17-20.

antecedently to the question of historical evidence, by the consideration that founders of great institutions, where they successfully observe and correspond to the conditions of their time, are able, to a certain degree at least, to anticipate the results of evolution and impress upon their foundations from the first an abiding form.[1] But it is a more satisfactory consideration that the Church is naturally of a piece with the Incarnation, the fruits of which it perpetuates; and that, as was pointed out in the last chapter, has a finality which belongs to its very essence. It is not that the religion of Christ, as final and supernatural, has no progress or development in it; it is not a code of rules covering all possible occasions of the future. But it is a religion which in its principles and essence is final—which contains in itself all the forces which the future will need; so that there is nothing to be looked for *in the department of religion* beyond or outside it, while there is everything to be looked for from within. This essential finality is expressed in the once for all delivered faith, in the fulness of the Spirit's presence and operation once for all granted to the Church, in the visible society once for all instituted; and it is at least therefore a 'tenable proposition'[2] that it should have been expressed in a once for all empowered and commissioned ministry.

That it is much more than a 'tenable proposition' —that it is a proposition which states a fact of history—it will be the business of succeeding

[1] This is conspicuously the case with Islam. Mohammed incorporated pre-existing elements of Arab and Jewish belief—of the Christian faith also in a debased form; it may be said with truth that there was no originality in the theology of Islam. But its founder incorporated the elements that came to hand into a book, and on the basis of his book founded a religion which with its motives, its institutions, its obligations, was a new thing in the world and yet had a remarkable completeness *ab ovo*. That is to say, it was as complete as its fundamental idea would allow of its being.

[2] See Hatch *B. L.*[2] pref. p. xii, where the coherence of ideas is recognised.

chapters to show. What it is proposed to do now is to clear up the *idea* of the Christian ministry—to explain what is meant by it, and why it is a reasonable idea—before we go on to test, with as rigorous a criticism as can be applied, its basis in history.

but the principle of the ministry must be first explained,

Why adopt such a method? it will be said. Why explain first what you are going to look for, and then proceed to look for it? Why not let the principle, whatever it may be, emerge simply from the facts? The answer is perhaps a twofold one. First, that the method here proposed corresponds to the method by which we actually in most cases arrive at convictions. We do not start afresh; we take the traditional belief, the traditional position, and test it. This is the normal method of human progress. If the traditional belief will not bear the light of facts, it has to be modified, or even reversed; we have to go through the process which a modern writer calls 'the correction of our premises.' But we give, and rightly give, a prerogative to an accepted position, so far at least as to start from it. Secondly, it may be answered that the method of hypothesis is one of the most normal methods of scientific inquiry. The scientific investigator is not asked to approach the facts without antecedent ideas, without anticipations, without desires; to ask this of him in the field of nature or of history is, in most cases, to ask an impossibility. What we have a right to expect is that the facts shall be looked at with severe impartiality and be allowed their legitimate weight to support, or contravene, or modify the original hypothesis. And further, the scientific investigator, when he makes public demonstration of the results of his investigations, is not expected to re-enact all the process he has himself gone through. He asks the right question at once; he propounds at once the right hypothesis, and proceeds

to verify it. That is what it is proposed to do here. There have been several theories—or, to speak more accurately, modifications of one theory—of the Christian ministry, which, as having more or less authority in tradition, have some prerogative claims to be examined, but which will not, as they are, stand the verifying test of facts. Underlying them there is a theory that will. There are, that is to say, a number of more or less perverted conceptions of what the Christian ministry has always essentially meant, as well as a true one. In what follows an attempt will be made to distinguish the true idea from its perversions.

Any one who undertakes to vindicate for any Christian truth or institution its claim to permanence or authority—its claim, that is, to be an integral part of the Christian revelation—is confronted on the threshold of his undertaking with a difficulty. The idea or institution has been abused, or overlaid with what exaggerates or disfigures it. He has to attempt what makes a considerable claim on mental patience, to draw distinctions between the abuse of a thing and its use, between the permanence of a thing in its fundamental principle and its permanence with the particular set of associations which in this or that epoch have clustered round it. This is remarkably true of the institution of the Christian ministry and the associated idea of the apostolic succession. It is maintained, though not perhaps with very much truth, that superseded elements of Judaism survived and discoloured more or less the conception of the ministry in the Church: it is much more certain that in the early Middle Ages this, with every other Christian institution, ran a great risk of becoming incrusted with associations left by the dying forms of paganism. Again, the ambition of the clergy and the spiritual apathy and ignorance of the mass of the

because its perversions have caused misunderstanding.

laity have led to its assuming false claims and a false prominence. Feudal and other passing forms of political society have adopted it and more or less perverted it to their own ends, so that, when their day was over or their support withdrawn, it has been left with its hold on human life weakened, because its true nature was overlaid and forgotten. Once again, it has lived in the security of uncritical epochs and based its claims on careless statements, and the steady rise of an exacter examination of facts has seemed to shake its foundations.

Thus the conception of the ministry needs purging before it can be vindicated.[1] 'There is a short way,' says St. Cyprian, 'for religious and simple minds both

[1] The learned Oratorian Morinus, in his work *Commentarius de Sacris Ecclesiae Ordinationibus* (Paris, A.D. 1655), offers a good example of a Christian student purging an idea in order to vindicate it. At the time when he wrote there were several false conceptions current on his subject. Notably, it was held that the essential 'matter' (or rite) of ordination lay in the 'tradition of the instruments,' i.e. the giving to the ordinand the characteristic vessels of his ministry. This scholastic doctrine had gained expression in a formal papal decree, though Morinus does not mention this. Eugenius IV. had written thus in his *Decretum de Unione Armeniorum* (the decree which affirmed the doctrinal basis of union with the see of Rome for the benefit of the Armenians, who were seeking reunion at the time of the Council of Florence A.D. 1439): 'Sextum sacramentum est ordinis, cuius materia est illud per cuius traditionem confertur ordo, sicut presbyteratus traditur per calicis cum vino et patenae cum pane porrectionem. Diaconatus vero per libri evangeliorum dationem. . . . Forma sacerdotii talis est: Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium in ecclesia pro vivis et mortuis, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti: et sic de aliorum ordinum formis prout in pontificali Romano late continetur' (Labbe-Coleti *Concilia* XVIII. col. 550). Here, it will be seen, there is no mention at all of the laying-on of hands: and this represented for some centuries the authoritative doctrine. The absence of the porrectio instrumentorum, with the accompanying words, from our ordination of priests had been made the standing objection against the validity of our orders (cf. Estcourt *Question of Angl. Ord.* pp. 260-1). This was due, as Morinus remarks (pars. iii. ex. i. 1), to the fact that the 'doctores scholastici' were 'Graecarum ordinationum ignari et antiquae Latinorum traditionis incuriosi.' He was at pains to make an appeal to antiquity. He investigated and reproduced in his work types of early Oriental ordinations from ancient Greek and other Eastern MSS., and demonstrated the absence of the ceremony in question from these rites. Yet Oriental ordinations were confessedly valid. He then reproduced the earliest types of Western ordinations from Latin MSS., and demonstrated that in the West the ceremony with its accompanying words was a later addition unknown in the first thousand years of the Church's history. He then asserted the principle that only that could be essential which had been the practice both in East and West, and the constant practice from the first, i.e. the laying-on of hands with accompanying prayer. Thus he purged the tradition. It is the frank inquiry which characterizes his work, and his genuine belief in historical evidence and its value as a corrective of current teaching, which has given his work the high place among works on ecclesiastical subjects which it deservedly holds.

to lay aside error, and to find and elicit the truth. For, if we go back to the head and origin of the divine tradition, human error ceases: the real nature of the heavenly mysteries is seen, and whatever was hid in darkness and cloud is opened out into the light of truth. If a canal which used to give a copious supply of water suddenly fails, men go to the fount to find the reason of the failure—whether the water has dried up at the spring, or has been intercepted in mid-course; so that, if this happened through a defect in the canal preventing the flow of the water, it may be repaired, and the water gathered for the supply of the city's wants may reach them in the abundance and fullness with which it left the fount. This is what, on the present occasion, the priests of God should do, keeping the divine precepts, so that, if the truth in any matter has been weakened or impaired, we may go back to the original of our Lord and to the evangelic and apostolic tradition, and let the principles of our action take their rise there, where our order had its origin.' [1]

The idea of the apostolic succession of the ministry.

Whether the idea now to be expounded represents 'the original of our Lord' and the 'apostolic tradition,' will be the question afterwards. We take it now only as an hypothesis, and it is this. Let it be supposed that Christ, in founding His Church, founded also a ministry in the Church in the persons of His Apostles.[2] These Apostles must be supposed to have had a temporary function in their capacity as founders under Christ. In this capacity they held an office by its very nature not perpetual—the office of bearing the original witness to Christ's resurrection and

[1] *Ep.* lxxiv. 10.

[2] 'By the Church on earth,' says Möhler (*Symbolism* pt. i. ch. 5 § 36), 'Catholics understand the visible community of believers, founded by Christ, in which, by means of an enduring apostleship, established by Him and appointed to conduct all nations, in the course of ages, back to God, the works wrought by Him during His earthly life for the redemption and sanctification of mankind are, under the guidance of His Spirit, continued unto the end of the world.'

making the original proclamation of the Gospel.[1] But underlying this was another—a pastorate of souls, a stewardship of divine mysteries. This office, instituted in their persons, was intended to become perpetual, and that by being transmitted from its first depositaries. It was thus intended that there should be in each generation an authoritative stewardship of the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ and a recognised power to transmit it, derived from above by apostolic descent. The men who from time to time were to hold the various offices involved in the ministry would receive their authority to minister in whatever capacity, their qualifying consecration, from above, in such sense that every ministerial act would be performed under the shelter of a commission, received by the transmission of the original pastoral authority which had been delegated by Christ Himself to His Apostles.

This is fundamentally what is understood by the apostolic succession of the ministry, and in the Western Church, at any rate from the time of St.

[1] See Pearson *Determinatio Theol.* i. (in his *Minor Theol. Works* i. pp. 283, 284; quoted by Dr. Liddon in *A Father in Christ*[2] pref. pp. x-xii): 'Ordinem episcopalem fuisse in ipsis Apostolis institutum, ac per successionem ab ipsis propagatum. Ad hanc assertionem explicandam sciendum est, concessam fuisse Apostolis duplicem potestatem, temporariam unam et extraordinariam, ordinariam alteram diuque permansuram. Prior potestas duplicem respectum habuit, ad Christum et ad Ecclesiam. Respectu Christi facti sunt Apostoli peculiares testes resurrectionis Eius; respectu domus Dei, facti sunt lapides in fundamento, h.e. ad praedicandam fidem haud prius revelatam, ad fundandas ecclesias, ad colligendum populum Deo, instituti et instructi. Posterior postestas erat regendi ecclesias iam fundatas, praedicandi verbum fidelibus collectis, administrandi sacramenta populo Dei, ordinandi ministros ad ecclesiastica munia, peragendi omnia ad salutem Christianorum necessaria. Quod erat in iis temporarium, id erat pure et peculiariter apostolicum; quod autem erat ordinarium et perpetuum, idem erat in eisdem proprie episcopale. Acceperunt totam potestatem a Christo: quicquid erat in eis personale, cum ipsis mortuum est; quicquid erat omnibus Ecclesiae temporibus necessarium, ipsorum, dum viverent, manibus transmissum est. Dixit Christus Apostolis "Sicut misit me Pater, ita et Ego mitto vos." Sicut Ipse habuit a Patre mandatum docendi populum, et ministros ad hoc necessarios necessaria auctoritate instructos deputandi; ita et Apostoli habuerunt idem officium et mandatum, cum eadem potestate ministros eligendi et ita successive usque ad consummationem saeculi continuata successione. Est itaque Apostolus episcopus extraordinarius, est episcopus apostolus ordinarius; atque ita episcopatus fuit in Apostolis a Christo institutus, in successoribus Apostolorum ab Apostolis derivatus.'

Augustin, it has always been its main meaning and often its only meaning. At the same time it does not exhaust the meaning of 'apostolic succession' as that phrase (or its equivalent) was first used and the idea first brought into prominence. When Catholic Christians of the second century, in the critical struggle with Gnosticism, appealed to the apostolic succession of their bishops, as well to their apostolic Creed and their apostolic Scriptures, they did not mean only that each Catholic bishop could trace his line of descent, from consecrated to consecrator, back ultimately to the apostles; for there might conceivably have been found in this or that Gnostic sect some bishop who could have made an identical claim. They meant also that each regularly appointed bishop of a Catholic community contributed the separate witness of his church to the tradition of the 'apostles' doctrine and fellowship,' and that these separate strands of witness when brought together and compared and found to be of the same type with one another constituted in their union an indestructible guarantee of continuity and stability. What then was from the outset implied in the regular appointment of a bishop? Obviously in the first place that only one individual could be the true representative for this purpose of each local community:[1] and such individual's right to be so regarded rested on two conditions or relations, his relation to the local community and his relation to the Church at large. Normally the former condition meant that he had been freely chosen by the faithful of the locality as the man they put forward to be their head, and the latter condition meant that this choice had been

[1] To give this principle a distinctive name it may be called 'monepiscopacy. It is what Bishop Bilson means when he mentions as 'the things proper to bishops which might not be common to presbyters' not only 'superiority in ordaining' but also 'singularity in succeeding': see *Perpetual Government of Christ's Church* ch. xiii.

ratified and made effectual by the bishops of the neighbourhood when they met to confer on the nominee of the community, through prayer and the laying-on of hands, the order of the episcopate. When these two conditions were properly satisfied, the newly elected and consecrated bishop was in rightful possession of the *cathedra* of his church vacated by his predecessor, so that he could now be said to be in full line of the succession from the apostles.

We may take as our hypothesis either the later and simpler or the earlier and more complicated idea of the apostolic succession, but in either case the ministry, thus conceived, corresponds in principle to the Incarnation and the sacraments, and, indeed, to the original creation of man. In all these cases the material comes from below. 'Of the dust of the ground the Lord God formed man.' Christ's humanity is of real physical origin of the stock of Adam. The material of the sacraments is common water, 'bread of the earth,' common wine. But this material, which is of the earth, is in each case assumed (though not in each case in the same sense) by the Spirit from above. 'God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life.' The Divine Son assumes the humanity, and makes it redemptive. A consecration from above comes upon the sacrament; 'the bread which is of the earth,' which man offers for the divine acceptance, 'receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but Eucharist, made up of two things, an earthly and a heavenly.'[1] In each of these cases we have the material offered from below and the empowering consecration from above. It is just these two elements, then, that are present to constitute the ministry. Those who are to be ordained are, like the Levites, the offering of the people; but

It corresponds to the Incarnation, etc.

[1] Iren. IV. xviii. 5.

they receive, like Aaron and his sons, their consecration from above.[1]

The principle of succession more important than the form of the ministry.

It is a matter of very great importance—as will appear further on—to exalt the principle of the apostolic succession above the question of the exact form of the ministry, in which the principle has expressed itself. What is meant is this: there have always (it is here supposed) existed in the Church ministers, who, besides the ordinary exercise of their ministry, possess the power of transmitting it; they may, so far, be one or many in each community; but, when they ordain men to the holy offices of the Church, they are only fulfilling the function intrusted to them out of the apostolic fount of authority. There are other ministers, again, who have certain clearly understood functions committed to them, but not that of transmitting their office. Should these ever attempt to transmit it, their act would be considered invalid. For this is the church principle: that no ministry is valid which is assumed, which a man takes upon himself, or which is merely delegated to him from below. That ministerial act alone is valid which is covered by a ministerial commission

[1] In the Dissertation on the Christian Ministry, appended to his commentary on the Philippians (on which see Appended Note A), Bp. Lightfoot maintains that the priestly tribe of the Old Testament were only the 'delegates of the people'—'the nation thus deputes to a single tribe the priestly functions which belong to itself as a whole' (pp. 182, 183: this essay will be referred to throughout the present work as *Dissertation*). Surely 'dormitat Homerus.' His reference is to the laying-on of hands *by the people upon the Levites* (Numb. viii. 10). But whatever significance this act had, it must not lead us to forget the ordination of the priests, the sons of Aaron. These had been consecrated to their office 'before this laying-on of hands upon the Levites took place, and with far different ceremonies, by Moses himself, without any intervention of the people whatever' (Willis *Worship of the Old Covenant* p. 112). Thus, if the Levites represent the self-consecration of the people, the 'lay-priesthood' (Numb. viii. 10-20), Aaron, who is to 'offer the Levites before the Lord' (ver. 11)—Aaron, *to whom, with his sons*, God is said to have 'given the Levites as a gift to do the service of the children of Israel' (ver. 19)—Aaron, and his sons the priests, represent the ministers of the covenant instituted by God Himself, whose prerogative was so jealously guarded, even against the sons of Levi, 'in the matter of Korah' (Numb. xvi.). 'Moses himself, as the representative of the Unseen King, is the consecrator' (Smith's *Dict. Bible*, s.v. PRIEST, ii. p. 917). [I am speaking of the Mosaic Law *in its final form*, as the writers of the New Testament knew it, without discussing the date of its different portions.]

received from above by succession from the Apostles. This is part of the great principle of tradition. 'Hold the traditions,' reiterates the Apostle. The whole of what constitutes Christianity is a transmitted trust—a tradition which may need purging, but never admits innovation, for 'nihil innovandum nisi quod traditum' is a fundamental Christian principle. For instance, the truth revealed in Christ is adequate to all time. It is fruitful of innumerable applications and adaptations to the new wants of each age. It may need setting free and purifying from accretions from time to time, but not more. What breaks the tradition is heresy—the intrusion, that is, of a new and alien element into the deposit, having its origin in personal self-assertion. This conception of heresy is involved in the very idea of a revelation once for all made. Now, what heresy is in the sphere of truth, a violation of the apostolic succession is in the tradition of the ministry. Here too there is a deposit handed down, a trust transmitted in the Church; and its continuity is violated, whenever a man 'takes any honour to himself' and assumes a function not committed to him. The individual, of course, who is guilty of the act may in any particular case, through the absence of right knowledge or from other causes which exempt from responsibility in whole or in part, not incur the responsibility; but judged by an objective standard, that is, in the light of the due relation between the individual member and the whole body, the act has the moral discolouring of self-assertion. The Church's doctrine of succession is thus of a piece with the whole idea of the Gospel revelation, as being the communication of a divine gift which must be received and cannot be originated,—received, moreover, through the channels of a visible and organic society; and the principle (this is what is here emphasized) lies at the last resort in the idea of

succession rather than in the continuous existence of what was called above 'monepiscopacy,' that is the maintenance of the succession through a single bishop in each see—even though it should appear that this too is of apostolic institution, and that the Church, since the Apostles, has never conceived of itself as having any power to originate or interpolate a new office.[1]

Its importance

It will be easy to see that the existence of an apostolic succession serves several important ends.

(i) as a bond of union in a spiritual society;

(i) It forms a link of historical continuity in a society intended to be universal and permanent. Nations have many bonds of union. There is the unity of blood and language and common customs: there is the unity of a common government over men inhabiting a common territory. Such bonds of union are lacking to a universal spiritual society such as the Church claims to be. Embracing all peoples and languages, admitting and consecrating the greatest varieties of local custom and taste, inhabiting no separate territory but spread over all the earth,[2] how should the Church preserve or exhibit its identity and continuity as a visible society without some such instrument and evidence of succession as is afforded by the ministry as traditionally conceived? No doubt it may be urged, and with partial truth, that the real unity of the Church lies in the Spirit, which lives in

[1] The words of the Anglican Art. XXIII. are: 'Non licet cuiquam sumere sibi munus publice praedicandi aut administrandi sacramenta in ecclesia, nisi prius fuerit ad haec obeunda legitime vocatus et missus. Atque illos legitime vocatos et missos existimare debemus, qui per homines, quibus potestas vocandi ministros atque mittendi in vineam Domini publice concessa est, in ecclesia cooptati fuerint et asciti in hoc opus.'

It should be noticed that the principle of *mission* is here asserted before the specific reference (Art. XXXVI. with the ordinal read into it) to actual orders in the ministry.

[2] We know how familiar a boast this is with early Christian writers. Cf. e.g. *Ep. ad Diognet.* 5: 'Christians [of the "new race" which has just come into the world, c. 1] are distinguished from the rest of mankind neither by land, nor by language, nor by customs. They have neither cities of their own, nor exceptional language, nor remarkable mode of life. But inhabiting Greek or barbarian cities as the lot of each determined, and following the local customs in dress and food and general conduct of life, the character of their own polity which they exhibit is everywhere wonderful and confessedly strange.' Cf. Iren. I. X. 2.

her, and in the truth she holds and teaches; but that truth was committed to a society, as to what Irenaeus calls 'its rich depository,'[1] and that Spirit has a body—and how can the outward organization, which enshrines and perpetuates the inner life, maintain or exhibit its identity without some such bond as the apostolic succession of the ministry affords?[2]

(ii) as declaring men's dependence on the gifts of Christ;

(ii) The ministerial succession serves the end of impressing upon Christians that their new life is a *communicated gift*, and from this point of view it is naturally associated with the sacraments. A Christian of apostolic days was taught by St. Paul to look back to the day of baptism as the moment of his incorporation into the life of Christ.[3] He had received the gift of the Spirit by the laying on of apostolic hands.[4] He was fed with the Body and Blood of Christ through the 'effectual signs' of bread and wine.[5] This sacramental method went to impress upon his mind the idea of his dependence upon grace given from without. True, this grace given from without could only be appropriated, incorporated, used, by the inward faculty of faith. This is the Christian principle of correspondence. When Christ was on earth healing men's sickness, the 'virtue' which went out of Him could—speaking generally—only be liberated to act in effective power on those who had 'faith to be healed,' and it was thus men's faith which made them whole, though the

[1] Iren. III. iv. 1: 'quasi in depositorium dives.'

[2] For an interesting statement of the function of the episcopal succession from this point of view, see F. D. Maurice's *Kingdom of Christ* pt. ii. ch. iv. § 5; also Gladstone *Church Principles Considered in their Results* ch. v. esp. pp. 193, 194: 'If it were attempted to insist on succession in doctrine as the sole condition of the essence of a Church, any such proposition would be self-contradictory, inasmuch as that which would be thus perpetuated would not be a society at all, but a creed or body of tenets.' What is required is 'succession of persons,' as well as 'continuous identity of doctrine.'

[3] Gal. iii. 27; Rom. vi. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Tit. iii. 5.

[4] Acts viii. 17-20, xix. 6; cf. Heb. vi. 2.

[5] 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. I do not see how it is possible to deny that the New Testament does attach inward gifts to external channels, i.e. is sacramental.

means of their healing was the virtue of Christ's body which came from without. His permanent redemptive activity upon the souls of men exhibits, and with less possibility of exception, the same law. He saves in virtue of an inward faith but by the instrumentality of a gift given from outside. This outward bestowal of grace was no peculiarity of the Apostolic age, though the symbolic miracles which at first called attention to it passed away. It is impossible to deny that the early Christians believed in the sacraments as the covenanted channels of divine grace.[1] It is, indeed, part of God's condescending

[1] I may refer, in confirmation of what is said above, to the way in which the Fathers, at the end of the second century, emphasize the sacramental principle, as of a piece with the principle of the Incarnation, against the Gnostic depreciation of what is material. See a vigorous passage of Tertullian (*de Resurr. Carn.* 8), emphasizing how, at each stage of the spiritual life, the inward gift is mediated through the material body—and that, of course, implies through a material sacrament. 'When the soul is attached to God, it is the flesh which enables it to be attached. The flesh is washed that the soul may be cleansed: the flesh is anointed that the soul may be consecrated: the flesh is signed with the Cross that the soul too may be protected: the flesh is shadowed with the imposition of hands that the soul too may be illuminated by the Spirit: the flesh is fed with the Body and Blood of Christ that the soul too may be filled with the fatness of God.' Cf. *de Bapt.* 2, quoted on p. 164. This is no advance upon the principle of Irenaeus. To Irenaeus the bread and wine are consecrated to become the Body and Blood of Christ, and so to impart eternal life even to man's body (IV. xviii. 5): and again, 'the cup which has been mixed and the bread which has been made receives the word of God, and becomes the Eucharist of the Body [and Blood] of Christ, and the substance of our flesh grows and gains consistence from these. How, then, can they say that our flesh is not susceptible of the gift of God, which is eternal life—our flesh, which is nourished by the Body and Blood of the Lord, and which is His member?' (V. ii. 3). Irenaeus' contemporary at Alexandria, Clement (though his exact view of the Eucharist is hard to grasp or state), certainly believed that the sacraments convey to us the life and being of Christ; cf. *Paed.* i. 6. This would appear in Dr. Bigg's references *B. L.* pp. 105, 106 [ed. 2 pp. 140, 141]. But we may go back earlier. The simple account which, earlier in the second century, Justin Martyr gives of the meaning of the Christian sacraments (*Apol.* i. 61, 65-67) carries conviction that Irenaeus and Tertullian are stating no new doctrine: 'for not as common bread or common drink do we receive these things; but just as our Saviour Jesus Christ was made flesh by the word of God, and for our salvation had both flesh and blood, so we have been taught that that food by which our flesh and blood are nurtured is, when thanks are offered over it by prayer in words that come from him, the flesh and the blood of that Jesus who was made flesh.' We go back to the beginning of the century, to Ignatius, and we find the same stress on the sacraments in the earliest stage of controversy with Gnosticism. 'The heretics,' he writes (*ad Smyrn.* 6, 7), 'abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they confess not that the Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which by His goodness the Father raised up. They, therefore, who speak against the gift of God, die by their disputing.' [Bp. Lightfoot cites in illustration of this Tertullian's 'Hoc est corpus meum, id est figura mei corporis.' Tertullian's language about the Eucharist is remarkable, but taken

compassion that He should thus embody in visible form His divine gift. So it is made most easily intelligible and accessible to the ignorant.[1] So it is most easily and forcibly impressed on men's minds that Christ has come, not merely to show them what in any case they are, but to make them what apart from Him they cannot be. 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.'[2]

Aristotle represented man as 'self-sufficient'—not indeed as an individual, but as a member of an organized society, the city of Greek civilization. If he needed to come into contact with God, that was rather at the circumference of his life and as the remote goal of its highest efforts. Christianity, on the contrary, represents man as fundamentally and from the first dependent upon God. It proclaims that man's initial step of true progress is to know his utter, his complete dependence,—that the essence and secret of all sin is his claim to be independent, to be sufficient for himself. Thus Christ, when He came to restore men to their true selves and to God,

as a whole it suggests—not that he believed in no 'real presence' in the elements, but that he regarded the consecrated bread as a figure of Christ's body, in the sense that, remaining bread, it, so to speak (like Christ's body on earth) *embodied* the spiritual presence or spirit of Christ which it was to communicate: see my *Dissertations* (Murray, 1895), pp. 308 ff. On Tertullian's use of 'figura' cf. *Journal of Theological Studies* (1906) vii. 595.]

The earliest language about baptism also is very emphatic in making it the instrument of the new birth and its accompanying purification. See Hermas *Vis.* iii. 3 § 5, *Sim.* ix. 16, and Barnabas *Ep.* 11. The only early Christian writings which seem to take a low view of the sacraments are very Judaic, e.g. the not very early (Ebionite) Clementines and the *Didache*, which, though primitive and not Ebionite, has no hold on the doctrine of the Incarnation or of the grace which flows from it.

[1] It is instructive to contrast in this respect Christianity with Neo-Platonism. Communion with God—oneness with God—was regarded by the philosophers as attainable only through intellectual self-abstraction from the things of sense and an ecstatic rapture possible but to a very few 'select' natures. In the Church it was believed to depend upon a simple act, possible to the most ignorant. 'Take, eat; this is My Body.' 'He that eateth My Flesh dwelleth in Me, and I in him.'

[2] F. W. Robertson (*Sermons*, 2nd series, pp. 55, 56) attempts to make baptism merely an *announcement of what is*, instead of a creative or re-creative act: but this is to do violence to the whole body of Scriptural and ecclesiastical language. The Church is the 'new creation,' and the sacraments are 'practica' or 'efficacia signa.'

did all that was necessary to emphasize that their restoration must be by the communication of a gift from outside, which they had not and could not have of themselves. This is the essential message of Christianity, and is what differentiates its whole moral scheme down to its very foundations from that of Aristotle. Yet in the second part of the Aristotelian position Christianity recognises a divine truth, of which man had never lost his hold; man must still realize his true being in a society, the city of God. Only in the divine household of the Church can he be fed with his necessary portion, the bread of life.

But if it be important to impress upon men's minds, permanently and persistently, as a part of a catholic system, their dependence upon gifts bestowed from outside, it must be admitted that there is no way of making the impression more effective than by the institution in the Christian household of a stewardship, which should represent God, the giver, distributing to the members of the divine family their portion of meat in due season; and it is quite essential that such stewards should receive their authorisation by a commission which makes them the representatives of God the giver, and not of men the receivers. 'It is the doctrine of ministerial succession by commission from the Apostles which makes, and which alone makes, this required provision for representing to us, along with the matter of the Revelation, and as needful to its due reception, this lively idea of its origin.' [1]

(iii) as meeting the moral needs of those who minister.

(iii) The apostolic succession seems to correspond, as nothing else does, to the moral needs of the ministers of Christ's Church.[2] 'How shall they preach,' said St. Paul, 'except they be sent?' He himself had been sent by an immediate mission from

[1] Gladstone *Church Principles* p. 208.

[2] See Dr. Liddon's sermon *The Moral Value of a Mission from Christ.*

Christ as direct, as *visible* (so he believed) as that which empowered the other Apostles. When he exhorts Timothy to use his ministry courageously, it is by recalling his mind to an actual external commission received, with its actual and accompanying gift.[1] 'There is not in the world,' says Bishop Taylor, 'a greater presumption, than that any should think to convey a gift of God, unless by God he be appointed to do it.'[2] Such appointment or commission, to be valid, must be of an authority—not unquestioned indeed, for St. Paul's was questioned, but—not justly open to question as representative of Christ. Men are needed for Christ's ministry who have ready wills and clear convictions, men, that is, with a sense of vocation; but they must be also men of humility, distrustful of their own impulses and powers, like the prophets of old. The very thing that such men need is the open and external commission to support the internal sense of vocation through all the fiery trials of failure and disappointment, of weariness and weakness, to which it will be subjected—nay, to be its substitute when God's inward voice seems even withdrawn—maintaining in the man the simple conviction that, as a matter of fact, 'a dispensation has been committed' to him.

The idea of the apostolic succession is, then, we may claim, in natural harmony both with the moral needs of men and with the idea of the Church. Such a succession of ministers would serve, as nothing else could serve, equally as a link of continuity in the society, and as an institution calculated to represent to men's imaginations the dependence of the Christian life upon God's gifts, and as a means of supplying a satisfying commission to those called to share the ministry.

[1] Rom. x. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6, iv. 5.
[2] *Ductor Dubitantium* in his *Works* [ed. 1828] xiv. p. 26.

But it is objected to on the following grounds:

On the other hand, objections are raised against it which may best be considered before we approach the discussion of the historical evidence, especially as the consideration of them will serve to put more clearly before our minds what the exact conception is which is to be subjected to the test of history.

The most important of them may be summarized under five heads:—

(1) the doctrine of the apostolic succession is sacerdotal:
(2) it postulates—what is so incredible—that bad or unspiritual men can impart spiritual gifts to others:
(3) it is incompatible with the true ideal of liberty:
(4) it is exclusive in such a sense as to be fatal to its claim:
(5) the chances against its having been actually preserved are overwhelming.

(1) 'It is sacerdotal.'

(1) 'The doctrine of the apostolic succession is sacerdotal.' This we admit in one sense and deny in another. It is necessary for us in fact to draw a distinction between what we regard as legitimate and what as illegitimate sacerdotalism.[1] For the term is associated historically with much that is worst, as well as with much that is best, in human character. Priesthood has been greatly abused. But must not the same be said of liberty, or of State authority? Must not it be said of religion itself, in common with all the greatest and most ennobling truths? What would become of us if we should agree to abandon every idea and institution which has become corrupt, or been exaggerated, or made to minister to ambition and worldliness? Life would be a barren thing indeed! There is surely no better task for the wise man than to set himself to vindicate the truths which

[1] Dr. Liddon *University Sermons*, 2nd series, p. 191: 'A formidable word, harmless in itself, but surrounded with very invidious associations.' See the whole passage.

lie behind persistent and popular errors and abuses —to the reality and power of which, indeed, the very popularity and persistence of the abuses bear witness.

The chief of the ideas commonly associated with sacerdotalism, which it is important to repudiate, is that of a *vicarious* priesthood.[1] It is contrary to the true spirit of the Christian religion to introduce the notion of a class inside the Church who are in a closer spiritual relationship to God than their fellows. 'If a monk falls,' says St. Jerome, 'a priest shall pray for him; but who shall pray for a priest who has fallen?'[2] Such an expression, construed literally, would imply a closer relation to God in the priest than in the consecrated layman, and such a conception is beyond a doubt alien to the spirit of Christianity. There is 'no sacrificial tribe or class between God and man.' 'Each individual member [of the Christian body] holds personal communion with the Divine Head.'[3] The difference between clergy and laity 'is not a difference of kind'[4] but of function. Thus the completest freedom of access to God in prayer and intercession, the closest personal relation to Him, belongs to all. So far as there is gradation in the efficacy of prayers, it is the result not of official position but of growing sanctity and strengthening faith. It is an abuse of the sacerdotal conception, if it is supposed that the priesthood exists to celebrate sacrifices or acts of worship in the place of the body of the people or as their substitute. This conception had, no doubt, attached itself to the 'massing priests' of the Middle Ages. The priest had come to be regarded as an individual who held, in virtue of his ordination, the prerogative of offering sacrifices which could win God's gifts. Thus spiritual advan-

The ministerial priesthood, however, is not vicarious,

[1] See Maurice *Kingdom of Christ* part ii. ch. iv. § 5 *ad fin.*
[2] *Ep.* xiv. 9 (a very early letter of Jerome, A.D. 373).
[3] Bp. Lightfoot *Dissert. on the Christian Ministry* p. 181.
[4] Liddon *l.c.* p. 198.

tages could be secured for the living and the dead by paying him to say a mass, and greater advantages by a greater number of masses. Now this distorted sort of conception is one which the religious indolence of most men,[1] in co-operation with the ambition for power in 'spiritual' persons, is always tending to make possible. It is possible to believe not only in a vicarious priesthood of sacrifice, but also in a vicarious office of preaching, which releases the laity from the obligation to make efforts of spiritual apprehension on their own account. But in either case the conception is an unchristian one. The ministry is no more one of vicarious action than it is one of exclusive knowledge or exclusive spiritual relation to God.

but representative;

What is the truth then? It is that the Church is one body: the free approach to God in the Sonship and Priesthood of Christ belongs to men as members of 'one body,' and this one body has different organs through which the functions of its life find expression, as it was differentiated by the act and appointment of Him who created it. The reception, for instance, of Eucharistic grace, the approach to God in Eucharistic sacrifice, are functions of the whole body. '*We* bless the cup of blessing,' '*we* break the bread,' says St. Paul, speaking for the community: '*we* offer,' '*we* present,' is the language of the liturgies.[2] But the ministry is the organ—the necessary organ—of these functions. It is the hand which offers and distributes; it is the voice which

[1] Cf. p. 299 *infra*, where stress is laid upon the disastrous effect of secularity in the Church in widening the gulf between clergy and laity.

[2] 1 Cor. x. 16. It is remarkable that Hugh of St. Victor (*Summ. Sentent.* tract vi. c. 9, quoted by Morinus *de Sacr. Ord.* pars. iii. ex. v. 1. 4) gives as the current reason for denying that heretics or schismatics could consecrate the Eucharist the fact that in the Eucharist the *priest speaks for the whole Church*: 'Aliis videtur quod nec excommunicati nec manifesti haeretici conficiunt [corpus Christi]. Nullus enim in ipsa consecratione dicit offero, sed offerimus, ex persona totius ecclesiae. Cum autem alia sacramenta extra ecclesiam possint fieri, haec nunquam extra. Et istis magis videtur assentiendum.' The idea of the representative character of the

consecrates and pleads. And the whole body can no more dispense with its services than the natural body can grasp or speak without the instrumentality of hand and tongue. Thus the ministry is the instrument as well as the symbol of the Church's unity, and no man can share her fellowship except in acceptance of its offices.

on the analogy of the old covenant.

Why is this conception unreasonable? The people of Israel of old were 'a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation' (Exod. xix. 6). But that priestliness which inhered in the race had its expression in the divinely ordained ministry of the Aaronic priesthood.[1] The Christian Church is in an infinitely higher sense 'a royal priesthood, a holy nation.'[2] But why should

priesthood in the ministry of the eucharistic sacrifice finds beautiful expression in the prayers (ascribed traditionally to St. Ambrose) which are used in the West as a *Preparatio ad Missam*: 'Profero etiam,' the celebrant prays, '(si digneris propitius intueri) tribulationes plebium, pericula populorum, captivorum gemitus, miserias orphanorum, necessitates peregrinorum, inopiam debilium, desperationes languentium, defectus senum, suspiria iuvenum, vota virginum, lamenta viduarum.' He is the mouthpiece of the needs of 'all sorts and conditions of men.' As the necessary mouthpiece for the expression of these needs in the eucharistic celebration, the representative priest is in a certain sense a go-between, a mediator. Thus this same prayer has earlier these words: 'quoniam me peccatorem inter te et eundem populum tuum medium esse voluisti, licet in me aliquod boni operis testimonium non agnoscas, officium saltem dispensationis creditae non recuses, nec per me indignum eorum salutis pereat pretium, pro quibus victima salutaris dignatus es esse et redemptio.'

[1] It is maintained without any adequate ground (Smith's *Dict. Bible* s.v. PRIEST) that the Levitical priesthood was in a sense *the substitute* for the general priesthood, instead of its expression—that the special priesthood was appointed because the people refused to realize the priesthood which belonged to them all—so that it was in this sense a *pis aller*, a δεύτερος πλοῦς. There is no evidence for this. The same chapter which recognises the general, recognises also a special priesthood, Exod. xix. 22-24. It would appear in fact that the developed conception of the Jewish priesthood as maintaining the consecration and holiness of the whole nation in its relation to Jehovah, the conception which is prominent in Ezekiel (chap. xliii. ff.) and in the Law of Holiness (Levit. xvii.-xxvi.), is but the expression of the fundamental idea of the 'priestly kingdom,' *i.e.* the 'peculiar' people consecrated to Jehovah, cf. Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18. 'The business of the priest,' says Mr. Montefiore (*Hibbert Lectures*, 1892, p. 318), 'is to make a holy community among whom God may dwell. . . . It is the central conception of the priestly code.'

[2] βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα ἔθνος ἅγιον, 1 Pet. ii. 9. βασιλεία, ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ, Rev. i. 6. St. Peter is quoting, and St. John is referring to, the words in Exodus.

I do not wish to press the analogy of the old and new covenants too far. Single Christians are often spoken of as 'priests,' and not merely as belonging to a priestly race. This is natural enough. For undoubtedly all Christians have an individual union with God and freedom of approach to God, which (so to speak) individualizes that in them which can be rightly called priesthood. I only use the argument to prove this—that a ministerial priesthood is in no contradictory relation to a general priesthood.

It is not inconsistent with the general priesthood,

that priesthood exclude, and not rather involve, a ministry through which it finds official and formal expression — and that not by mere expediential arrangement, but by divine ordering? Let us examine the notion of the general priesthood of all Christians as it finds expression, for example, in Justin Martyr in the middle of the second century.[1]

as taught by Justin,

'Just,' he says, 'as Joshua, who is called by the prophet [Zech. iii. 1] a priest, was seen wearing filthy garments . . . and was called a brand plucked out of the burning because he had received remission of sins, the devil also, his adversary, being rebuked, so we, who through the name of Jesus have believed as one man in God, the Maker of all, have been stripped through the name of His First-begotten Son of the "filthy garments" of our sins; and being set on fire by the word of his calling are the genuine high-priestly race of God, as God beareth witness Himself [Mal. i. 11], saying that "in every place amongst the Gentiles men are offering sacrifices acceptable to Him and pure," and God receives from no man sacrifices, except through His priests. So, then, of all the sacrifices through this name, which Jesus the Christ delivered to be made, that is (the sacrifices) at the Eucharist of the bread and of the cup, which in every place of the earth are made by the Christians, God by anticipation beareth witness that they are acceptable to Him.'

Here is indeed a vivid consciousness of the priesthood which belongs to the Church as a whole,[2] but which finds expression in a great ceremonial action —the Eucharist—an action which belongs not to the individual, but to the whole body, and is celebrated by the 'president of the brethren.'[3] How, then, is this

[1] *Dial. c. Tryph.* 116, 117.

[2] It appears that the idea of the priesthood of the Christian Church as a whole carried with it a thought not to be found in the Old Testament, at least directly—the thought of approach to God *on behalf of others*. The Christians are high-priests on behalf of the world. They are the 'soul of the world'; the world is their prison-house, but they 'keep it together' (*Ep. ad Diognet.* 6). They can plead effectually for the empire and mankind. So Aristides, *Apol.* c. 16: 'I have no doubt that the world stands by reason of the intercession of Christians.' Cf. Tertull. *Apol.* c. 30. This function of the Church St. Paul presses on St. Timothy. The Church is not to confine intercessions to her own body—'I exhort that prayer, etc., be made *for all men*,' 'for God will have *all men* to be saved'; 'He is the Saviour of all men,' though 'specially of them that believe' (1 Tim. ii. 1-4, iv. 10).

[3] προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον (*Apol.* i. 65). He offers the prayers and Eucharist, and the people say Amen. This 'president' is presumably the bishop. So Harnack (*Expositor*, May 1887, p. 336).

priesthood interfered with, if we should find reason to believe that Christ Himself ordained ministers of this mystical action—such as did actually exist in Justin Martyr's days—to be the mouthpieces of the Church in its celebration?

Irenaeus, No one, again, is more identified than Irenaeus with the principle of the apostolic succession. He regards it undoubtedly as of the essence of the Church. Her mark, her character, is 'according to the successions of the bishops.'[1] Yet he does not hesitate to say that in some sense 'every just man is of the priestly order,' and 'all the disciples of the Lord are priests and Levites'—that is, they have the freedom of the old priesthood, not its ministry.[2] If it be said that Irenaeus is admittedly 'unsacerdotal,' that is, that he does not apply the term priesthood to the Christian ministry,[3] it may be pointed out, further, that writers who confessedly are sacerdotal in their conception of the ministry still continue down into the Middle Ages to speak also without hesitation of the general priesthood.[4] For the official hierarchy

and later writers.

[1] IV. xxxiii. 8: 'character corporis Christi secundum successiones episcoporum.'

[2] IV. viii. 3, V. xxxiv. 3; see Lightfoot *Dissert.* p. 252. The point in both passages is that our Lord in justifying the conduct of His disciples when they broke the Sabbath (St. Matt. xii. 1-5) claimed for them and for David in virtue of their righteousness the freedom of priests, 'who profane the Sabbath and are blameless.' Again, inasmuch as, like the Levites, our Lord's disciples had 'no inheritance,' they could, like the Levites, claim support. Thus 'they were allowed when hungry to take food of the grains.' In both cases the priesthood which belongs to good men or disciples lies in a certain *freedom*, not in any power of ministry.

[3] See further in chap. III. pp. 178-182. I have endeavoured there to point out that the idea of a gradual growth in sacerdotalism in the early Church hardly corresponds to the facts. There is a change rather in language than in principle.

[4] Thus Origen, who admittedly takes a sacerdotal view of the ministry (see further chap. III. p. 144 n.[1]), speaks of the priesthood of all Christians or of special classes (other than the clergy) of Christians: see Lightfoot *Dissertation* p. 257, and the less one-sided statement in Bigg *B. L.* p. 215 [ed. 2 p. 259] n.[1]

Origen's whole system of exegesis requires that the Old Testament should have a spiritual as well as a literal, a remoter as well as a more obvious, sense; this 'moral' meaning he finds for the Levitical ordinances and priesthood in the Christian Church, but not always quite in the same form. In particular two lines of interpretation may be distinguished. (1) Sometimes Israel as a whole is the Church. In that case ordinary Christians correspond to the other tribes, while the priests and Levites are those Christians 'who are devoted to the divine word and are dedicated sincerely to the sole worship of God,' *in Joann.* i. 3 [2], the 'few and rare' souls who have given themselves to wisdom and knowledge, and who have therefore the Lord Himself, the

offered no bar to its recognition, provided that the general priesthood was not supposed by those churchmen who recognised it (as in fact it was not) to carry with it the power of ministry. It may be worth

true Wisdom, for their inheritance, *in Iesu Nave* xvii. 2. (2) Sometimes, and this is the predominant thought throughout the *Homilies on Leviticus*, the whole body of Christians correspond to the Jewish priesthood. 'To the whole Church of God and people of believers is the priesthood given,' *in Lev.* ix. 1: 'all we who believe in Christ' are priests, *ib.* xiii. 5: 'as many as have been anointed with the unction of the sacred chrism have been all of them made priests,' *ib.* ix. 9. But all priests must have offerings and sacrifices to make: and here again the interpretation wavers. If at one place primary stress seems laid on the 'grace of baptism and unction of chrism and the word of the law' (*ib.* vi. 5), and it is the abandonment of church-going and consequent loss of hearing the Scriptures which chills the priestly fervour of Christians (*ib.* ix. 9), more commonly the thought turns away from Christian life in the world to emphasize the life of divine knowledge or the life of renunciation. And to the difference of these two classes of Christians, the ordinary and the advanced, corresponds the difference of priestly dress within and without the sanctuary (*ib.* iv. 6).

There is therefore to Origen a priesthood common to every baptized or perhaps especially to every confirmed Christian, and also (not always sharply distinguished from this) a special priesthood of spiritual insight or of sacrifice (poverty, celibacy, martyrdom): but these are *moral* priesthoods, 'secundum moralem locum,' 'secundum rationem mysticam,' 'secundum spiritalem intellegentiam' (*ib.* i. 5, ii. 4, ix. 6, 9, xv. 3), and do not in any sense exclude for Origen the *ministerial* priesthood of the Christian clergy.

Dr. Bigg notes that *in Num.* ii. 1 Origen, as represented by his translator, speaks of the clergy and of 'virgins and ascetics and all who are *in professione religionis*,' and thinks that 'there was a strong tendency in Origen's mind to restrict the language of the Priesthood of the Christian to these "religious."' With this we may compare, among the scholia on the Apocalypse attributed to Victorinus of Pettau (but not by him in their present form) the following on c. xx: 'Qui enim virginitatis integrum servaverit propositum et decalogi fideliter praecepta impleverit . . . iste vere sacerdos est Christi et millenarium numerum perficiens integre creditur regnare cum Christo et apud eum recte ligatus est diabolus.'

For a recognition of the general priesthood among later sacerdotal writers, cf. Leo the Great *Serm.* iii. 1: 'ut in populo adoptionis Dei, cuius universitas sacerdotalis atque regalis est, non praerogativa terrenae originis obtineat unctionem, sed dignatio caelestis gratiae gignat antistitem.' *Serm.* iv. 1: 'In unitate igitur fidei atque baptismatis indiscreta nobis societas et generalis est dignitas, secundum illud beatissimi Petri. . . . Vos autem genus electum, regale sacerdotium, gens sancta, populus acquisitionis. Omnes enim in Christo regeneratos crucis signum efficit reges, sancti vero Spiritus unctio consecrat sacerdotes; ut praeter istam specialem nostri ministerii servitutem universi spiritales et rationabiles Christiani agnoscant se regii generis et sacerdotalis officii esse consortes.' August. *de Civ. Dei* xvii. 5. 5: 'Sacerdotium quippe hic ipsam plebem dicit, cuius plebis ille sacerdos est mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Iesus.' *Quaest. Evang.* ii. 40. 3: 'Sacerdotium vero Iudaeorum nemo fere fidelium dubitat figuram fuisse futuri sacerdotii regalis, quod est in ecclesia, quo consecrantur omnes pertinentes ad corpus Christi summi et veri principis sacerdotum. Nam nunc et omnes unguuntur quod tunc regibus tantum et sacerdotibus fiebat, . . . ipsi nondum accepto baptismatis sacramento nondum spiritaliter ad sacerdotes pervenerant.' See the same idea in a collect of the Gelasian Sacramentary (Bright *Ancient Collects* p. 99: Wilson *The Gelasian Sacramentary* p. 93 [Wednesday in Easter week]). Hence we get a priesthood ascribed, as by St. Irenaeus, to *each Christian* (though of course as a member of the one body) in virtue of baptism and unction. St. Jerome (*adv.*

while to quote a passage which seems to push to its extremest point the right of the priesthood which is common to all in virtue of their baptism and confirmation.

'From that day and that hour in which thou camest out of the font thou art become to thyself a continual fountain, a lasting remission. Thou hast no need of a teacher, or of a priest's right hand. As soon as thou ascendedst from the sacred font thou wast clothed in a white robe and anointed with the mystic ointment; the invocation was made over thee, and the threefold power came upon thee, which filled the new vessel that thou wert with this new teaching. Thenceforth it made thee a judge and arbiter to thyself; it gave thee knowledge to be able of thyself to learn good and evil—to discern, that is, between merit and sin. And because thou couldest not, whilst in the form of the body, remain free from sin, it placed thy remedy after baptism in thyself, it placed remission in thine own judgment, that thou shouldest not, when need should be urgent,[1] seek a priest, but thyself, as a cunning and clear-sighted master, correct thine error within thee and wash away thy sin by penitence; and so hardness might cease, despair be over, apathy be at an end. The fountain never fails, the water is within, the

Lucifer. 4) writes: 'sacerdotium laici id est baptisma.' So Isidore of Seville (*de Eccl. Off.* ii. 25) writes: 'Postquam Dominus noster verus rex et sacerdos aeternus a Deo Patre caelesti mystico unguento est delibutus, iam non soli pontifices et reges sed omnis ecclesia unctione chrismatis consecratur, pro eo quod membrum est aeterni sacerdotis et regis. Ergo quia genus regale et sacerdotale sumus, ideo post lavacrum ungimur, ut Christi nomine censeamur.' Cf. Alcuin [Albinus Flaccus] *Ep. ad Oduinum*, ap. Hittorp *de Div. Cath. Eccl. Offic.* (Colon. 1568) p. 100 [ed. 1591, p. 85]: 'Sacro chrismate caput perungitur . . . ut intelligat se diadema regni et sacerdotii dignitatem portaturum'; Rabanus Maurus *de Inst. Cler.* i. 29, ap. Hittorp p. 322 [ed. 1591, p. 274]; Ivo of Chartres ap. Hittorp p. 469 [ed. 1591, p. 410]; Walafrid Strabo *de Reb. Eccl.* 16, ap. Hittorp p. 401 [ed. 1591, p. 341]—of the common priesthood of all in the Eucharist, the generale sacerdotium; Paschasius Radbert *de corp. et sang. Domini* ix. 6: 'Idcirco teneamus nos ad istum pontificem et sacerdotem Christum, et in illo maneamus, quia per hoc quod ille in nobis est et nos in illo, etiam et ipsi omnes sacerdotes dicimur et sumus'; cf. St. Thomas Aquinas *Sum.* iii. q. 82. art. 1. 'Laicus iustus unitus est Christo unione spiritali per fidem et charitatem, non autem per sacramentalem potestatem; et ideo habet spiritale sacerdotium ad offerendum spiritales hostias.'

The consideration of such passages as these will serve to show that sacerdotalism is not incompatible with an even zealous recognition of a lay priesthood. The only form of expression which seems to have passed away was that by which all Christians were called in some sense *priests and Levites*, and even 'high-priests' (Origen). But they were not so called, by either Origen or Irenaeus, in any sense which suggests *ministerial* powers. The point of comparison lies in nearness to God and constant service (Origen), or in a certain sort of freedom and privilege (Irenaeus). There is an admirable passage in Mason's *Relation of Baptism to Confirmation* (1891) on the common Christian priesthood in its relation to holy orders, pp. 462-3; and there are in the same work frequent examples of its recognition by the Fathers, especially as the result of confirmation (chrism) pp. 11, 148, 160, 201, etc.

[1] That is, probably, 'when sin required a remedy.'

washing is in thine own judgment; sanctification is in wakefulness, remission in the dew of tears.'[1]

Such language sounds unsacerdotal, but it comes out of the sacerdotal Church of the West in the sixth century, as it would seem. It could have been used in any age previous to the time when confession was made compulsory. But the writer of these words would not have dreamt of admitting that this freedom of the Gospel belonged to a man except as a member of the Church, baptized and anointed and a communicant, and therefore dependent on the ministry of her clergy.

Thus the principle of the ministry must not be assailed either on the ground that it 'interposes a sacerdotal caste between the soul and God,' or on the ground that it connives at the spiritual indolence of men, by offering them official substitutes to do their religion at second hand.[2]

The true sacerdotalism.

The ministerial principle, then—the sacerdotalism which cannot be disparaged or repudiated—means

[1] S. Laurentii *Hom.* i. *de Poenit.* in *Bibl. Max. Vet. Patr.* (ed. 1677) ix. p. 466 h (Migne *P. L.* lxvi. 92 c). This and the following sermon of Laurentius (probably of Novara, c. A.D. 507; see *Dict. Chr. Biog.* s.v. LAURENTIUS [15] surnamed Mellifluus) are full of the thought of various activities of the will as opening the way of restoration from sin and making despair foolish: 'Homo, noli diffidere: res in promptu est, vita in manu est: virtus in voluntate est: victoria in arbitrio est: si voluisti, vicisti' (*l.c.* p. 469 g). The activity emphasized is sometimes penitence and tears; sometimes almsgiving, 'aqua et ablutio et remissio in eleemosyna largientis est' (ib.); sometimes fasting (p. 474 g).

[2] A word must be said to vindicate the true sacerdotalism from interfering with the unique Priesthood or High-Priesthood of Christ. Surely the representatives of a king do not interfere with his monarchy, and a Christian minister is in a relation to Christ infinitely more dependent than that of any representative of an absent king to him who sends him. If we were consistent, such a notion of the 'jealousy' of Christ as militates against a ministerial priesthood would make us 'fifth-monarchy men,' because kings as much interfere with His unique Kingship as ministers do with His Ministry. Nor is it very consistent to accuse the ministerial priesthood at once of interfering with the incommunicable Priesthood of Christ and also with the Priesthood which He has communicated to all His members. The Church indeed must have a priesthood, not although Christ has one, but because He has. What He is, the Church is in Him. All He is in His Human Nature, the Church is; in Him the Church has a priesthood therefore, because Christ is High-priest. The only question is as to the distribution of functions in the Church, and whether Christ has willed to delegate a special sort of authority to a special class of men to be exercised in His name for the good of the whole body—and this is a question of evidence, with which we are not yet dealing.

just this: that Christianity is the life of an organized society in which a graduated body of ordained ministers is made the instrument of unity. The religious life, so far as it concerns the relations of man to God, has two aspects. It is first an approach of man to God. And in this relation each Christian has in his own personal life a perfect freedom of access. But he has this because he belongs to the one body, and this one body has its central act of approach to God in the great memorial oblation of the Death of Christ. Here it approaches in due and consecrated order; all are offerers, but they offer through one who is empowered to this high charge, to 'offer the gifts' for God's acceptance and the consecration of His Spirit. In the second place, religion is a gift of God to man—a gift of Himself. What man receives in Christ is the very life of God. Here again, each Christian receives the gift as an endowment of his own personal life; his whole life may become a life of grace, a life of drinking in the Divine Spirit, of eating the Flesh of Christ and drinking His Blood. But the individual life can receive this fellowship with God only through membership in the one body and by dependence upon social sacraments of regeneration, of confirmation, of communion, of absolution—of which ordained ministers are the appointed instruments. A fundamental principle of Christianity is that of social dependence.

In all departments of life we are dependent one on another. There is a priesthood of science ministering the mysteries of nature, exercising a very real authority and claiming, very justly, a large measure of deference. There is a priesthood of art, ministering and interpreting to men that beauty which is one of the modes of God's revelation of Himself in material forms. There is a priesthood of political influence, and that not exercised at will, but organized

and made authoritative in offices of state.[1] There is a natural priesthood of spiritual influence belonging (whether they will it or not) to men of spiritual power. It is to this natural priesthood that God offers the support of a visible authoritative commission in sacred things—'to feed His sheep.' The Christian ministry is at once, under normal circumstances, God's provision to strengthen the hands of the spiritual men, the natural guides of souls, by giving them the support which comes of the consciousness of an irreversible and authoritative commission: and it is also God's provision for days when prophets are few or wanting, that even then there may be the bread of life ministered to hungering souls, and at least the simple proclamation of the revealed truth, so that even then 'men's eyes may see their teachers.'

(2) 'Unspiritual men cannot impart spiritual gifts.'

(2) But it will be said: Such a doctrine would be credible enough if the priests of the Gospel had been, or were at present, in the main men of spiritual power, or even universally good men. But how is it conceivable that men of evil or utterly unspiritual lives, such as too many of the clergy have been, can be God's instruments to impart His spiritual gifts to others? Surely spiritual gifts must come from spiritual persons.

But we are forced to distinguish between character and office.

Church history records how strongly this objection has often appealed to men, but it is one which rather admits of being strongly felt than consistently argued. It would have of course much more force if it were possible reasonably to deny that, on the whole, in Christian history spiritual office and spiritual

[1] 'If it be granted, as it well may be, that proper qualifications are a hundredfold more requisite for the Christian ministry than for any other office, this would not remove nor lessen the obligation not to dispense with a divine commission, supposing it to have been granted and still attainable, any more than the highest legal knowledge or perfect integrity of character would dispense with the necessity of a commission from the source of temporal power to render the decisions of a magistrate of state binding and effectual' (Denton *Grace of the Ministry* p. 23).

character have tended to converge; that, on the whole, the ministry has been a spiritualizing force in society. As it is, it may be briefly met with a threefold answer. First, we reply, with Pope Stephen and St. Augustin of old,[1] that 'the unworthiness of the ministers hinders not the grace of the sacrament,' because the Holy Spirit, and not they, is the giver of the grace; they neither 'give it being nor add force to it.' For according to the truest view of the sacraments, the 'grace' conveyed in them represents the personal action of the Holy Spirit, who on each occasion when the sacrament is duly administered acts afresh, according to the divine promise, from the centre of His own personality. St. Ambrose accordingly [2] deprecates the idea of priests being spoken of as having power over the divine gifts which they minister. Secondly—and so far as the argument relates to the intention of Christ in founding His Church—we reply that He clearly recognised that moral unworthiness does not interfere with official authority. The Scribes and Pharisees who sat in Moses' seat—who held, that is, the succession from Moses—were to be obeyed, even where they were least to be imitated;[3] and all 'the twelve' had equally the authority and powers of the apostolate, though 'one of them was a devil.'[4] Thirdly, we reply that the possibility of ministers unworthy of their office is involved in the very idea of a visible society in which good and bad are to be mixed together. There is really no more difficulty in believing that bad men can share the functions of

[1] See *Dict. Chr. Biog.* s.v. CYPRIAN i. p. 752. Of course the force of this argument depends on the recognition that there are such things as sacramental channels of grace. The personal defects of the minister gain a wholly new importance in religious bodies where sacraments, creeds, and liturgies are unrecognised, i.e. where all his usefulness depends on his personal character and capacities.

[2] See Ambrose *De Spiritu S.* prol. 18: 'Nostra enim servitia, sed tua sunt sacramenta. Neque enim humanae opis est divina conferre.' Cf. Paschasius Radbert *de corp. et sang. Dom.* xii. 3 and *Lux Mundi* (ed. 1895), p. 244.

[3] St. Matt. xxiii. 2-3. [4] St. John vi. 70.

the ministerial priesthood than that bad men share the priesthood which belongs to all Christians and which differs from the other, as has been said, not in kind but in application and degree. Yet the whole method of appeal used by the apostolic writers to unworthy Christians, is to address them not as men who lack the prerogatives and spiritual powers of the Christian life, but as men who do not 'walk worthily of the vocation with which they were called.' There is really again no more difficulty in recognising in a bad priest a steward of divine mysteries than in a bad magistrate a steward of divine justice, a 'minister of God for good.'[1] 'There is this difference,' says an old writer,[2] 'betwixt the ecclesiastical ministers or magistrates, and ministers or magistrates of state; if these offend, the whole world can distinguish betwixt their persons and their functions; no disparagement falleth upon any but the offenders. But if ecclesiastical persons become obnoxious, then they confound their persons and their functions, and transfer the shame of the faults of some even upon all, yea upon the whole order itself.'

(3) 'It is inconsistent with the modern ideal of liberty.'

(3) Now we approach another objection: The apostolical succession is associated with bygone ideas of authority, with the divine right of kings, and with a state of society which is gone for ever; it is incompatible with the true ideal of liberty.

But the Church is not to be identified with mediaeval absolutism,

It is astonishing how frequently, and from what opposite quarters, we meet with the identification of Christianity with that phase of Christianity which is characteristic of the Middle Ages. At that period we become witnesses of a process which is at least of absorbing interest. The untamed, undisciplined races which formed the material of modern nations are

[1] Rom. xiii. 3-6.

[2] Isidore of Pelusium *Epist.* ii. 52 (paraphrased by Hickes *Dignity of Episc. Order* in his *Treatises* [Oxford, 1847] ii. p. 288).

subjected to the yoke of the Church (mostly at the will of kings or chiefs), as to an external law which is to train, mould, restrain them. The one need of such an age is authority, discipline, rule. The Church becomes largely a 'schoolmaster to bring men to Christ'—a law preparing for a Gospel. She has, under these circumstances, to do with children in mind. The one faculty which is in full exercise is faith, in the form of a great readiness to accept revelations of the supernatural world and to respect their ministers—the sort of faith which wants nothing but dogmatic clearness and a sufficiently firm voice of authority.[1] Christianity thus becomes, by a one-sided development, a great imperial and hierarchical system.

Such a state of things is not permanent. Men's faculties develop into free exercise, and constitute their separate departments according to an inevitable law, as knowledge grows and life becomes more complex. Other natural 'priesthoods' arise—in art, in science, in medicine, and in politics, in trade, in law—and become the successful rivals, in their own spheres, of the spiritual hierarchy. The Church, to all appearance, suffers loss, though in regions which were not properly her own at all, at least in such sense as to justify her in dictating terms to the pioneers in each on their own subject-matter. Thus the area in which religious authority speaks and faith accepts becomes limited. More than this: authority itself tends to change its character; it ceases to be absolute in religion no less than in politics; and this change affects the Church, not only as a dogmatic authority, but as a government. It affects her hierarchical system. Mere imperialism will no longer

[1] The saintly writers, like St. Bernard, who lived in these vaunted 'ages of faith,' do not suggest a too favourable view of them. They help us to see that an unspiritual credulity, such as characterized those times, is no nearer Christian faith, in its full sense, than a good deal of modern scepticism.

suffice, at least for the most vigorous or intelligent races, in the Church, any more than in the State. Democracy, the representative system, is in the air as much as free inquiry and has to be reckoned with.

and true liberty is opposed to absolutism, not to authority.

But in politics this transition does not mean a repudiation of the principle of authority. 'What the world thirsts for at present,' said Joseph Mazzini, who was surely no friend to despotism, 'is *authority*.'[1] What has come about is a change in the conditions of authority, in the character which it must assume. This holds true in the Church also; there, too, authority must cease to be absolutism and faith mere acceptance. Authority, however, is not less real because it is limited, or faith less zealous because it is rational and inquiring.[2] But then it is said: 'You are really abandoning the principle; you are only trying to cloak your surrender by keeping a name, emptied of its power. The authority of a Church or hierarchy really ceases when it cannot dictate its own terms, when it has to submit to criticism.' To this objection there seems to be a complete answer, and one which needs to be forced on the consideration of men. Christianity did not come into existence in the West, or just in time for the Middle Ages. Christianity spread in a Greek world—in a society of the most developed sort, containing all the elements of intellectual development in free activity. If we want to know the

[1] See his 'Thoughts upon Democracy in Europe' (*Life and Writings* vol. vi. [London 1870] p. 115): cf. 'On the Duties of Man,' chap. viii. (vol. iv. [1867] p. 313): 'Liberty is not the negation of all authority: it is the negation of every authority that fails to represent the *Collective Aim* of the nation.'

[2] 'Is a limited, conditional government in the State such a wise, excellent, and glorious constitution? And is the same authority in the Church such absurdity, nonsense, and nothing at all, as to any actual power? If there be such a thing as obedience upon rational motives, there must be such a thing as authority that is not absolute, or that does not require a blind, implicit obedience. Indeed, rational creatures can obey no other authority; they must have reasons for what they do. And yet because the Church claims only this rational obedience, your Lordship explodes such authority as none at all' (Law's *First Letter* pp. 67-8: in the collected edition of Law's *Works*, 1762, vol. i. p. 30).

original character of Christian authority and Christian faith, we should study Greek church life from St. Paul to the fifth century, or, at any rate, early church life before Western Christianity took the peculiar colour of Romanism.

Government in the early Church was representative,

We are concerned here, however, not with Christianity as a dogma, but with the social life and government of the Church. In this department, then, when we look back to the life of the early Christian communities, what a beautiful picture of freedom, of representative institutions, of the correlation of rights and duties, we find for our contemplation. The sacred ministry receives indeed its authority from above and acts in God's name, as God's representative; but the man who is to minister is the elect of the people, and is their representative also. Thus the Apostles ordained the first deacons, but the Church elected them. 'Look ye out, brethren, from among you seven men of good report, whom we may appoint over this business.' So spoke the Apostles to the first Christians. 'And the saying pleased the whole multitude, and they chose' seven men, 'whom they set before the Apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands upon them.' So in the subapostolic age Clement speaks of the presbyter-bishops as ordained from above,[1] but with *the consent of the whole Church*, and in such a way as to suggest that, under certain circumstances, they were not exempt from the judgment of the Church. Other documents of the first age speak in the same way of the election of bishops by the community.[2] Nor does this method of popular election, or control over election, appear only in the dim

[1] Clem. *ad Cor.* 40 and 44. More will be said on this: see p. 283.

[2] *Didache* xv. 1: χειροτονήσατε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους. Cf. also the very ancient *Apostolic Church Order* 16: 'If there be a paucity of men, and in any place there be a number less than twelve of those who can vote for a bishop'; and the *Church Order* of Hippolytus (see p. 132 below): 'Let a bishop be ordained who has been chosen by the whole people.'

shadow of the subapostolic age: counteracted at all times by other influences,[1] it yet lasted on as the ideal of the Church for centuries. The emperor Alexander Severus 'was fond of praising the careful way in which the Church posted the names of all whom she destined for the priesthood, so that any who knew evil of them might object.'[2] He would have it made a model in the appointment of provincial governors. We know, again, that the bishop to be elected over any church was to be thoroughly known in the church—one who had passed through the inferior grades of the ministry. 'That custom is to be diligently observed,' says Cyprian, 'as of divine tradition and apostolic observance, which is maintained amongst us also and almost over all provinces, that, with a view to the due celebration of ordinations, all the nearest bishops of the same province should come together to the community for which a ruler is to be ordained, and the bishop should be chosen in the presence of the people who have complete knowledge of each man's life and conduct by his conversation among them.'[3] This popular check on ordinations he requires no less for the presbyterate and the diaconate. So, again, it is regarded by Pope Julius as monstrous that 'Gregory, a stranger to the city, who had not been baptized there and was not known to the community in general and had not been asked for by presbyters or bishops or people,' should be obtruded on the church of Alexandria, 'whereas the ordination of a bishop ought not to have taken place thus lawlessly and contrary to the

[1] As in the first period by prophetic nomination; see Clem. Alex. *Quis Dives* 42: 'St. John would go about here to appoint bishops, . . . there to ordain to the clergy *some one of those pointed out by the Spirit.*'

[2] Mason *Persecution of Diocletian* pp. 84, and 85 n.[1]: 'dicebatque grave esse, cum id Christiani et Iudaei facerent in praedicandis sacerdotibus qui ordinandi sunt, non fieri in provinciarum rectoribus quibus et fortunae hominum committerentur et capita' (Aelius Lampridius *Alex.* xlv. 7).

[3] *Ep.* lxvii. 5; see Bingham *Ant.* ii. 10. 2.

ecclesiastical canon, but by the provincial bishops, in the church itself [over which he is to rule], out of the priesthood, out of the actual body of the clergy, and not, as now, in violation of the canons which come from the Apostles.'[1] Priscillian the Spaniard, again, gives us, as the sentiment of the bishops contemporary with him in Spain about A.D. 380, the view that, 'as a bishop's consecration lies with the bishop, so the choice of whom to ask for lies with the people.'[2] Once more Leo the Great, 'the founder of the papacy,' writes: 'He who is to preside over all must be elected by all.' 'Before a consecration must go the suffrages of the citizens, the witness of the people, the judgment of persons of distinction, the choice of the clergy—that the rule of apostolic authority may be in all respects observed, which enjoins that a priest to govern the Church should be supported not only by the approval of the faithful, but also by the testimony of those without.' 'No metropolitan should we allow to ordain a "priest" [i.e. bishop] on his own judgment without the consent of clergy and people: the consent of the whole community must elect the president of the Church': only where division makes unanimity impossible the metropolitan may decide the election in favour of the man who has the best support. 'No reason can tolerate that persons should be held to be bishops' (so he says on another occasion to the bishop of Narbonne) 'who were neither chosen by the clergy, nor demanded by the laity, nor ordained by the provincial bishops with the consent of the metropolitan.'[3] Quotations to this effect might be greatly multiplied, and from later sources. The Latin rites

[1] ap. Athan. *Apol. c. Ar.* 30.

[2] Priscillian, *Tract.* ii. (ed. Schepss in the Vienna *Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.* § xviii. p. 40): 'sicut dedicationem sacerdotis in sacerdote, sic electionem consistere petitionis [in] plebe.'

[3] Leo *Epp.* x. 4-6; xiii. 3; xiv. 5; clxvii. 1.

of ordination are framed in recognition of this representative system.[1] This then was undoubtedly *the ideal* of the bishop's election in the early Church.[2] The bishop was to be really the *persona* of the Church he ruled.

This, moreover, he was enabled to be in some real sense in virtue of the very small community over which he presided. Through the greater part at least of the Roman empire each town-community had its bishop, and the country-bishop supplemented his authority in the surrounding district, first in the East and later in the West. The bishop of Rome was in an extraordinary position in the middle of the third century, because he had under him as many as forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, and seven subdeacons, besides those of minor orders.[3] Ordinarily the numbers would have been very much smaller. Thus the bishop, according to the early ideal, was by no means the great prelate; he was the pastor of a flock, like the vicar of a modern town, in intimate relations with all his people.[4]

and not absolute.

Nor was he in theory absolute even within the limits of his 'parish' or diocese. For, in the first place, he was himself subject to the laws which he administered. So an ancient preacher, referring to the custom of holding the Gospel-book over the head of the bishop who is being ordained, says that it is to remind him that 'if he is the head of all, yet he acts under these laws [of the Gospel], ruling all and ruled by the law, ordering all and himself ordered': it is a symbol of the fact that he is 'under

[1] See App. Note C, p. 325. Cf. also R. B. Rackham in *Essays on Church Reform* (Murray 1898) pp. 72 ff.

[2] On the extent and limits of its observance see Bingham *Ant.* iv. 2. 2-7. Also *Dict. Chr. Ant.* s.v. BISHOP: Mr. Haddan, the author of the article, remarks how vaguely the words suffragium iudicium testimonium consensus are used (i. p. 214). Vague unformulated rights are more easily overridden.

[3] Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43. 11.

[4] The facts are well known: see Bingham *Ant.* ii. 12, Hatch *B. L.* lect. viii. The principle is exemplified in the *Apost. Ch. Order* 16, quoted above p. 85 n.[2].

authority.'[1] At first indeed this authority had no visible sanction; St. Cyprian claims repeatedly for the bishop that he is 'responsible to none but God.' But later it came to be embodied in provincial and ecumenical councils. Secondly, within his own diocese the bishop was associated with presbyters. No doubt his power was not subject to *formal* limitations; but round him there was the council of his presbyters, 'the Church's senate';[2] and St. Cyprian tells us that he made it a fixed rule from his consecration 'to do nothing on his own private judgment, but everything with the counsel of his clergy and the consent of his laity.'[3] The whole conception indeed of synods was that of a great representative system which culminated at last in the ecumenical council.[4] Thus the ideal of church government in early days was not at all absolute. If the guilds of the Roman empire represented, as they did, the elements of free life and spontaneous movement through all the classes of non-Christian society down to the lowest, the principle of liberty and spontaneity was at least as prominent and real in the supernatural society of the Church. It was by no means necessarily an imperialist institution, though its officers were of divine authority and apostolic descent.

The change to imperialism

But the effect of 'establishment' in the East was to tend to assimilate the Church to the empire in ideas and methods no less than in gradation of dignities. In the West the essentially imperialist temper of Rome moulded the institutions of Christendom, and gave them a new direction and new characteristics. Thus in the fifth century Socrates remarks that 'the episcopate of the Romans, like that of the

[1] *Hom. de uno legislatore* (fifth or sixth century?) printed among the 'spuria' of St. Chrysostom, ed. Bened. vi. 410: Bingham *Ant.* ii. 11. 8.

[2] Bingham *Ant.* ii. 19. 7.

[3] *Ep.* xiv. 4. See other references in Bingham *Ant.* ii. 19. 7, 8.

[4] Cf. art. CYPRIAN in *Dict. Chr. Biog.* i. p. 753: 'the assembly representative: each bishop the elect of his flock.'

Alexandrians, had already for some time advanced beyond the limits proper to the priesthood to the point of despotism.'[1] So it was that episcopacy passed into a new phase. The authority of kings and popes overwhelmed the democratic elements in the Christian polity. If they survived, they survived rather as names and forms than as realities. But names and forms still bear witness beyond their present power to a principle which is not dead.

Thus the mediaeval and modern prelate, Anglican or Roman, is not the only, or the original, type of bishop. He differs a good deal from the bishop of the earliest period—not indeed in fundamental, spiritual principle, but in outward appearance and rank.[2] We need not necessarily deplore the change. The age of barbarism and the age of feudalism had each its own needs, and the Church adapted herself to them. But there is a protest, based on the facts of church history, which it is essential to make:—that is, against all language such as would imply that Christianity had no history before it became dominated by imperialism and embedded in feudalism. The catholic principle is not Romanism merely or Byzantinism, nor is it identified with the Anglican episcopate of monarchical and aristocratic days. It has its roots deeper down in human nature than any of these. If, then, the imperialism which coloured church theology and church organization is becoming a thing of the past, there is nothing in church principles to prevent our saying: Let it die. 'The powers that be'—the actually existing authorities of the new age—'are ordained of God.' Meanwhile let us disentangle the essential and permanent creed,

not necessarily permanent.

[1] τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐπισκοπῆς . . . πέρα τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐπὶ δυναστείαν ἤδη πάλαι προελθούσης (*H. E.* vii. 11): he is speaking of Celestine suppressing the Novatian body in Rome. Cf. *ib.* vii. 7.

[2] Dr. Hatch describes the change in *B. L.* lect. viii. and *Growth of Ch. Instit.* See also Rosmini *Five Wounds of the Holy Church* ch. v.

the essential and permanent organization, from the passing phase of civilization in which they have become embedded; let us make clear what church principles essentially are. We shall not be afraid of the 'democratic' temper within the Church, so far as it is a return upon the Church's earliest spirit or an application of it. There is, however, one essential principle of all politics, secular and spiritual, which must be kept steadily in view: 'political rights are only the correlative of political duties done.' This is always the Church principle. Whatever rights the Christian layman should have, it must be as a Christian layman, i.e. as subject himself to the divine authority of the Gospel and to the Church, the common mother of clergy and of laity. For it is only as subject to discipline that we can take any part in the exercise of it, and the lesson which the ancient writer just cited finds in the ceremony of holding the Gospels over a bishop at his consecration [1] applies to the layman in his degree, at least as much as to the bishop in his: 'the layman is bound by the layman's ordinances.'

(4) 'It would unchurch non-episcopal bodies.'

(4) 'But,' it will be exclaimed, 'however reasonable the idea of a ministerial succession may be—however adaptable in principle to new conditions of society and thought—*in fact* it has become so unreasonable and so stereotyped, so fatally conservative of what was shown to be false and corrupt at epochs of past history, that great Christian nations, or great bodies of Christian men, have broken away from its organization. Are these, then, which have no succession, or a succession which you declare invalid, to be "unchurched"—to be declared outside the pale of the covenant and left in unrecognised isolation?' This question is always being asked in tones of passionate appeal or indignant remonstrance. As

[1] Pseudo-Chrysostom, see p. 89 n.[1].

Preliminary answer.

we shall have occasion to recur to the problem,[1] the less need be said here. Suppose, however, an impartial investigation to convince us that a ministerial succession was really part of Christ's intention and belongs only to the episcopal Churches in a legitimate sense, it will surely be our duty to maintain it and be faithful to it. Nor, if we are at all familiar with the disappointing side of church history, shall we be greatly surprised that its corruptions have bred revolt. These corruptions are, no doubt, so many apologies for the revolters. It is conceivable that they may reach the point of excusing revolt in particular cases and throwing the blame of it on the representatives of authority. If that were so, or so far as it was so, we shall abstain from condemning individuals or races, but we shall not abandon principles. Men are dealt with according to their opportunities; and as God's love is not limited by His covenant, so He *can* work through ministrations which are not 'valid'—that is, ministrations which have not the security of the covenant. But though God can do this, we have no right to claim it of Him. If He is not bound to His sacraments, we men, up to the limits of our knowledge,[2] certainly are. However excusable many may be in ignorance of divine institutions, we shall not be excusable if we are faithless to them for fear of hurting other men's feelings or disturbing existing arrangements. Such conduct would be most false charity, most real treachery. Bishop Butler[3] reminds us

[1] See below chap. VII. p. 304.

[2] When we speak of 'essentials' in religion, it is of course important to recall that God is a father and equitable, and that His action is not tied to His covenanted channels. There is a useful distinction drawn by Roman Catholic theologians between things necessary to salvation necessitate medii, i.e. absolutely and in all cases, and things necessary necessitate praecepti, i.e. obligatory upon all who are within the hearing of a divine ordinance. Only the right disposition of will is (we may say) essential in the first sense. This may exist under all conditions of ignorance. All else is necessary in proportion as we come under the responsibilities of nearness to God's revelation of Himself (cf. Newman's *Parochial Sermons* vol. VI. pp. 182-187—'Faith the Title for Justification').

[3] *Analogy* part II. ch. I.

'how great presumption it is to make light of positive institutions of divine appointment'; and he emphasizes to us 'the moral obligation, in the strictest and most proper sense,' which attaches to any command 'merely positive, admitted to be from God.' And if anything could increase this obligation, it would be the sense that we are living through an age of change. It is when there is a general 'shaking' of existing establishments—of all that has been merely recognised and customary —that religiously-minded men are likely to be driven back upon those institutions which can give the completest guarantee of security and permanence.

(5) 'It cannot have been maintained unbroken.'

(5) It has been contended by Lord Macaulay—and the contention was not a new one—that, however much the Church may have insisted on apostolic succession, as a matter of fact the chances are overwhelming against its having been preserved. 'Whether a given clergyman be really a successor of the Apostles depends on an immense number of such contingencies as these; whether, under King Ethelwolf, a stupid priest might not, while baptizing several scores of Danish prisoners who had just made their option between the font and the gallows, inadvertently omit to perform the rite on one of these graceless proselytes; whether, in the seventh century, an impostor, who had never received consecration, might not have passed himself off as a bishop on a rude tribe of Scots; whether a lad of twelve did really, by a ceremony huddled over when he was too drunk to know what he was about, convey the episcopal character to a lad of ten.'[1]

[1] Essay on *Gladstone on Church and State.* Chillingworth cannot be quoted in this sense, because in his argument (*Religion of Protestants* ch. ii. 67) he is taking into account that 'very dungeon of uncertainty,' the Romanist doctrine of intention.

This objection does not hold ;

Such an argument has nothing to recommend it except the vigour of Lord Macaulay's style. Indeed, if we take it on its own level, its force is gone when once it is borne in mind that failures of baptism do not enter into the question of the permanent succession, except where the person whose baptism was omitted or irregular subsequently became a bishop ; and that invalidating irregularities in episcopal ordinations, when they exist, would not have the effect which the objection supposes, because succession comes of interlacing lines, each bishop having, as a rule, been consecrated by three of his order.[1] The three consecrators were required originally as a guarantee of general provincial recognition. The idea of thereby securing validity (in case one of the bishops was, by some accidental omission of a necessary rite, no real bishop at all) is perhaps too materialistic to have entered into the mind of the early Church. When things were duly done according to Christ's ordinance, they were regarded as certainly having His certificate. But when validity came to be conceived under more materialistic conditions at a later period of theology, it was natural to suppose that each bishop who joined in the act of consecration gave additional security that it was valid. They were cooperatores and not merely testes.[2]

and we are responsible for no more than obedience.

But a much better answer to such a suggested difficulty lies in the consideration that, if we have reason to believe that Christ intended to institute a

[1] In fact it has been mathematically argued that, even if we make the absurd supposition of one consecrator in twenty at any particular moment in history having been, through some accident, himself not validly consecrated, the chances will be 8000 : 1 against all three consecrators in any given case being in a like position, and the chances against a bishop consecrated under such circumstances, who would thus be no bishop, being combined with coadjutors similarly incapacitated to continue the succession, are 'as 512,000,000,000 are to unity.' Gladstone *Church Principles* pp. 235, 236.

[2] The point is, however, discussed: see Estcourt *Question of Anglican Ordinations* pp. 110-114. I do not pursue the question, because I do not lay stress on the argument in the text.

self-perpetuating ministry in His Church, He makes Himself responsible for its possibility, and His power is not limited by such material conditions. 'Leaving, then, all hidden things to Him to whose sole cognizance they belong, we may securely depend on His goodness and justice, that so long as His sacred appointments are maintained, as far as lies in our power, we shall never suffer through any secret blemish or incapacity of His ministers.'[1]

With this much preface, giving (it may be hoped) a clearer idea of what the principle of the ministry and of the apostolic succession may really be said to mean, we turn to the witness of history.

[1] Archbp. Potter: quoted by Denton *Grace of the Ministry* p. 258.

CHAPTER III

THE WITNESS OF CHURCH HISTORY

The ministry in church history

THE conception of the Christian ministry described in the last chapter is confessedly no mere ideal. It represents what has been, beyond a doubt, a fact of primary importance in the Christianity of history.

In many respects, indeed, if we were to trace back the genealogy of the ministry in the Church, we should find that it has passed through strange vicissitudes, and from time to time has wonderfully changed its appearance. It may be well to call attention to this at once, so that variations of aspect which are even startling may serve to make more emphatic the principles and facts which have been throughout permanent and unchanging.[1]

in spite of variable features

For example, the episcopate of the first period, when, speaking generally, every town church had its independent episcopal organization, and country bishops arose to superintend the scattered flocks of the rural districts, was a very different thing from the episcopate of the mediaeval epoch, when the great dioceses of Teutonic Europe were formed, when bishops became great feudal lords, and the feudal character at times almost superseded the spiritual. Very different again was the organization of the Celtic Church of Ireland (and thence of Scotland), where the presbyter-abbots were the real ecclesiastical rulers and the succession of abbots the important succession,

[1] Cf. Dr. Liddon *A Father in Christ* p. 27 f.

while the episcopate, indefinitely multiplied, had its place only as the necessary 'instrument of spiritual generation,' or the appropriate decoration of sanctity, in entire subordination to the monastic authority.

Again, there have been vast changes in the relation of the bishops to secular society, and in their relation to one another. There has been the slow development of the metropolitan system on the lines of the imperial organization; the upgrowth of the papacy; the rise of national Churches; the schisms of the eleventh and sixteenth centuries. There have been 'Erastian' epochs, whether under the Byzantine and Frankish emperors or under English kings, and epochs, on the other hand, when a king[1] could complain that 'absolutely the only persons who reign are the bishops,' or when a pope could claim, as in the famous bull *Unam Sanctam*, to have the sword of secular authority committed to him as well as that of ecclesiastical government.

Again, there have been days when bishops administered, and submitted to, a rigorous discipline, such as finds expression in the early Spanish council of Elvira, and days of the collapse of discipline, such as gives the tone of something like despair to the lamentations of Basil and Gregory of Nyssa in the Arian period in the East, or such as Isidore and Gregory of Tours describe in the West.

There have been, once again, great changes in the idea of episcopal election, as it passes out of the primitive method—which made the bishop the real representative of the community in the midst of which he had grown up, 'behaving himself well in the inferior offices,'—to become the prerogative in fact, if not in name, of metropolitans, or popes, or kings.

[1] Chilperic (Greg. Tur. *H. F.* vi. 46); but the context, as well as the circumstances, take away from the force of this.

has been governed throughout by fixed principles,

These have been immense changes. In part they have been inevitable and beneficial; in part the recognition of them should be a stimulus to the Church to recover in idea, and so at last in fact, a primitive standard which ought never to have been abandoned. But all through these changes there have been certain fixed principles of supreme importance, which have been uniformly maintained, and which all the changes in outward circumstance only serve to throw into stronger relief; and it is with these alone that we are here concerned. These fixed principles represent what the Church has continuously believed with reference to the ministry, and consistently acted upon (let us say to start with) since the middle of the second century down to the period of the Reformation. They may be expressed thus:

such as the requirement of apostolic succession, etc.

I. that Christ instituted in His Church, by succession from the Apostles, a permanent ministry of truth and grace, 'of the word and sacraments,' as an indispensable part of her organization and continuous corporate life:[1]

II. that while there are different offices in this ministry, especially an episcopate, a presbyterate, and a diaconate—with functions and mutual relations fundamentally fixed, though containing also variable elements—there belongs to the order of Bishops,[2]

[1] That this belief is justified by the evidence of the Gospels is shown in chap. iv.: that the Church of the period after 150 A.D. held the belief is made so evident by the quotations which follow in this chapter in proof of principle ii., that no separate section is given to proving it. For the earliest statement of the principle outside the New Testament, see Clement of Rome, pp. 279, 280 below.

[2] I reckon the bishops as a distinct *order*; see, however, on the supposed anomaly of the church of Alexandria, and what it implies, pp. 118 ff. and 315 ff. The later tendency to reckon the episcopate as constituting with the presbyterate only one ordo sacerdotum (*Catech. Conc. Trident.* ii. 7. 25) was due partly to the desire to emphasize the pre-eminent dignity of the sacerdotium; partly to the desire to reduce church orders to the mystical number of seven; partly to the wide influence of Jerome in the West (see below pp. 157 ff.). It has its parallel in early days when the bishop was sometimes reckoned with the presbytery. See on the variations *Dict. Chr. Ant.* ii. pp. 1474-5 s.v. ORDERS, HOLY. But so long as bishops are regarded as having special functions of their own, which presbyters cannot validly perform, and are ordained with a special ordination (*Catech. Conc. Trident.* l.c.), the exact ordering of grades is rather a matter of nomenclature. Morinus, among

and to them alone, the power to perpetuate the ministry in its several grades, by the transmission of the authority received from the Apostles, its original depositaries; so that, as a consequence, no ministry except such as has been received by episcopal ordination can be legitimately or validly exercised in the Church:

III. that the transmission of ministerial authority, or Ordination, is an outward act, of a sacramental character, in which the laying-on of hands, with prayer, is 'the visible sign.' It will appear also

IV. that the effect of Ordination was always regarded as indelible in the sense that no man truly ordained could ever be re-ordained:

V. that the Church, without change of principle, and merely by the clearing-up of ideas, came to recognise as a Priesthood the ministry of bishops and presbyters which ordination conferred.

The general recognition of these principles during the period specified will hardly be matter of dispute. 'In the latter part of the second century of the Christian era, the subject [of the apostolic succession] came into distinct and formal view; and from that time forward it seems to have been considered by the great writers of the Catholic body a fact too palpable to be doubted, and too simple to be misunderstood.'[1] The agreement, however, as to what has historically been accepted in the Church on the subject of the ministry is not nearly complete enough to render argument unnecessary. We proceed then, first of all, to review the evidence for the existence of the threefold ministry, after the middle of the second century,[2] with the accompanying

Evidence produced: **I. Of the episcopal successions from** A.D. 150,

more recent Roman theologians (A.D. 1655), says of those who reckon eight orders of the ministry, major and minor, by counting the episcopate as a distinct order: 'huic sententiae plurimum favent rituales omnes tam Graeci quam Latini et universa prope ecclesiae traditio' (*de S. Ord.* p. iii ex. i. 2. 26), and his authority is very high.

[1] Gladstone *Church Principles* p. 189.

[2] For the reason for not at first going back behind about A.D. 150 see p. 197.

principle of the apostolic succession and the limitation to bishops of the right of ordination.

as appealed to by Irenaeus.

I, II. The basis shall be laid in the testimony of Irenaeus. Irenaeus had been born in Asia Minor not later than A.D. 130.[1] He tells us that in early youth he had sat at the feet of Polycarp, 'who had been appointed by Apostles a bishop in Asia in the church of Smyrna'[2]—a venerable old man, whose appearance and ways of life were, he assures us, indelibly imprinted on his memory—and that he had listened to his discourses in public and private,[3] and that he had also had opportunities of instruction by Asiatic 'elders,' amongst whom some at least had been disciples of Apostles. Thus imbued with the traditions of the Asiatic Church, in which especially St. John's influence was a living reality, he passed as a young man, probably before Polycarp's martyrdom (A.D. 155 or 156), from Asia to Rome. How long he remained there we do not know; but at the latest in the year 177, when the persecution fell upon the churches of South Gaul and the aged bishop Pothinus was one of many victims, Irenaeus was a presbyter of Lyons, and he succeeded the martyr in his episcopal see. Previously, however, he had visited Rome, in order 'to promote the peace of the Church' by bearing communications from the Gallican confessors to Eleutherus, the bishop, on the subject of the Montanist controversy.[4] True to his name of 'peaceful,' he again intervened, as has been

[1] For this and other details of St. Irenaeus' life see *Dict. Chr. Biog.* iii. p. 253 f.

[2] Iren. III. iii. 4 (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 14. 3, 4).

[3] See his epistle to Florinus in Euseb. *H. E.* v. 20. 6.

[4] Euseb. *H. E.* v. 3, 4: *Dict. Chr. Biog.* iii. p. 937 s.v. MONTANUS. It is *possible* that there was at this time no other episcopal see in Gaul than that of Lyons, and that Irenaeus was consecrated at Rome. Eusebius *H. E.* v. 23. 3 speaks of the παροίκιαι κατὰ Γαλλίαν ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπεσκόπει, and Duchesne *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* i. (Paris, 1894) p. 41 interprets this to mean 'plusieurs groupes des chrétiens . . . un seul centre ecclésiastique, un seul évêque, celui de Lyon,' though in another passage (p. 39) he excludes Gallia Narbonensis from this sweeping generalization; but cf. M. Tixeront *Les origines de l'église d'Edesse* (Paris, 1888) p. 14.

already mentioned (p. 17), in the dispute between Victor of Rome and the Asiatic churches in the matter of keeping Easter, to rebuke Victor for his hasty breach of ecclesiastical unity on the ground of an indifferent matter of custom, not of the faith.

The value of his witness.

Thus much account of the man has been given in order to emphasize his remarkable connexion alike with the apostolic traditions which lingered in that last home of the apostolic band, the churches of Asia, and with the sentiments of the contemporary churches both of East and West. Irenaeus was fitted by circumstances, as well as by character, to be what he pre-eminently claims to be, the staunch maintainer of apostolic tradition. Of course the 'tradition of the elders'[1] to which he so frequently refers is not infallible.[2] Elders may have made mistakes, or Irenaeus' memory may have been treacherous as to this or that point of their record, in spite of his assertion that he recalled the scenes of his youth when he was in the company of Polycarp in all their details with more precision than recent events. The value of tradition depends very much on the exact point for which it is alleged. But a mistake or failure of memory, not hard to account for in details of tradition, cannot invalidate his testimony in matters of such primary importance as the character and traditional reputation of the church ministry, or, to take another example, the authority of the four Gospels during the period covered by his own eastern and western experience. On such matters a mistake is hardly possible.

[1] ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 20 (the epistle to Florinus).

[2] He gives us, on the authority not only of Papias but also of other 'elders' who remembered St. John to have related it among our Lord's discourses, the fabulous prophecy ascribed to Him of the Millennial Vines (v. xxxiii. 3, 4). He bases also on the authority of these same elders—'all the elders who gathered round John, the disciple of the Lord, in Asia'—as recording St. John's teaching, the statement that our Lord was over forty years old (II. xxii. 5).

We take Irenaeus, then, for our primary witness as to the apostolic succession. He is combating Gnosticism in his great work *Against the Heresies*—or to give it its full title *Exposure and Refutation of Science falsely so called*—written probably during his episcopate; and, in view of the imaginative idealism of the Gnostic teachers, he rests his case in the main on the historical revelation. He is therefore not so much occupied in developing a Christian 'science' over against the 'science falsely so called' of his opponents—this was rather the work of the Alexandrians—as in emphasizing what the rule of faith has been in the churches as derived from the apostolic preaching.[1] In the consent of all the churches he finds the security of the tradition. The case was put by his more epigrammatic disciple Tertullian in the question: 'Is it probable that so many churches of such importance should have hit by an accident of error on an identical creed?'[2]

His appeal to the episcopal successions,

There is, then, ever before Irenaeus' eye the picture of the one Church, spread over all the world, handing down in unbroken succession the apostolic truth: and the bond of unity, the link to connect the generations in the Church, is the episcopal succession. Irenaeus' use of language, indeed, about the bishop is not quite determinate;[3] the venerable title of 'presbyter,' the 'ancient' or 'elder,' is still used in an inclusive sense for the Church's rulers. But the idea is quite determinate. He regards the bishops in every church as succeeding in an especial sense to the Apostles.

[1] Γνῶσις ἀληθὴς ἡ τῶν ἀποστόλων διδαχὴ καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς ἐκκλησίας σύστημα κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου (IV. xxxiii. 8).

[2] 'Ecquid verisimile est, ut tot ac tantae [ecclesiae] in unam fidem erraverint?' (*de Praescr.* 28.)

[3] That is, he calls the bishops also *presbyters*. See III. ii. 2 (compared with III. iii. 2); IV. xxvi. 2, 4, 5; *Ep. ad Vict.* ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24. 14—in this passage and in some others οἱ πρεσβύτεροι is perhaps best represented in English as 'the fathers.' So the Anonymous Presbyter who writes against Montanism (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 16) speaks of the church authorities at Ancyra, bishop no doubt included, as 'the presbyters.' So (as will appear) Clem. Alex., Origen, Firmilian.

They represent in every place by apostolic succession the catholic faith; they have the 'gift of the truth' and the apostolic authority of government;[1] they are the guardians also no doubt of the grace by which Christians live, of which as much as of the truth the Church is the 'rich treasury.'[2] But it is mainly as preserving the catholic traditions that Irenaeus regards the apostolic succession. From this point of view he makes it without hesitation one of the primary essentials of Christianity.

'The true *Gnosis*' (so he calls the Christian religion) 'is the doctrine of the Apostles, and the ancient system of the Church in all the world, and the character of the body of Christ according to the successions of the bishops, to whom they [the Apostles] delivered the church in each separate place: which *Gnosis* has come down to us jealously preserved, without any forgery of scriptures. With us is the full Preaching, admitting of neither addition nor subtraction, and the Lessons unadulterated, and the Exposition of the Scriptures neither abnormal nor careless nor perilous nor irreverent, and the pre-

[1] 'Charisma veritatis certum' (IV. xxvi. 2); 'quibus etiam ipsas ecclesias [apostoli] committebant . . . quos et successores relinquebant suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes' (III. iii. 1).

[2] 'Depositorium dives' (III. iv. 1). So in III. xxiv. 1 he speaks of the preaching of the Church as being witnessed to 'per universam Dei dispositionem et eam quae secundum salutem hominum est solitam operationem, quae est in fide nostra; quam [praedicationem] perceptam ab ecclesia custodimus et quae semper a Spiritu Dei, quasi in vase bono eximium quoddam depositum iuvenescens et iuvenescere faciens ipsum vas in quo est. Hoc enim ecclesiae creditum est Dei munus, quemadmodum ad inspirationem plasmationi, ad hoc ut omnia membra percipientia vivificentur: et in eo disposita est communicatio Christi, id est Spiritus sanctus, arrha incorruptelae et confirmatio fidei nostrae et scala ascensionis ad Deum. In ecclesia enim, inquit, posuit Deus apostolos, prophetas, doctores et universam reliquam operationem Spiritus, cuius non sunt participes omnes qui non concurrunt ad ecclesiam. . . . Ubi enim ecclesia, ibi et Spiritus Dei, et ubi Spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia et omnis gratia; Spiritus autem veritas. Quapropter qui non participant eum, neque a mammillis matris nutriuntur in vitam, neque percipiunt de corpore Christi procedentem nitidissimum fontem' [Jo. vii. 38]. We observe here in what close and inseparable connexion he puts the gifts of grace and truth. The gifts of grace he connects specially with the sacraments, regeneration with baptism (v. xv. 3), incorruption with the Eucharistic gifts (IV. xviii. 5: ὡς γὰρ ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἄρτος, προσλαβόμενος τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου· οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτά). It cannot, I think, be reasonably doubted that Irenaeus would have regarded the episcopate as entrusted with the ministry of the sacraments, no less than of the truth, though it was not his present business to lay stress on this; cf. his words to Victor (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24. 17): 'Anicetus allowed Polycarp to celebrate the Eucharist in the church at Rome' (παρεχώρησεν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν).

eminent Gift of love.'[1] Again, 'The way of those who belong to the Church is encompassing the whole world, because it holds the tradition firm from the Apostles, and enables us to see that the faith of all is one and the same, while all teach one and the same God the Father, and believe the same dispensation of the Incarnation of the Son of God, and acknowledge the same gift of the Spirit, and meditate the same precepts, and preserve the same form of that ordination which belongs to the Church, and expect the same coming of the Lord, and await the same salvation of the whole man, both soul and body.'[2]

These summary statements of what constitutes Christianity are valuable as showing that to Irenaeus Christianity is not an idea but an institution, a catholic Church, and in the Church the essential link of continuity is the apostolic succession. To it therefore he makes his great appeal against the Gnostics.[3]

[1] 'Γνῶσις ἀληθὴς ἡ τῶν ἀποστόλων διδαχή, καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς ἐκκλησίας σύστημα κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου, et character corporis Christi secundum successiones episcoporum, quibus illi eam quae in unoquoque loco est ecclesiam tradiderunt: quae pervenit usque ad nos custoditione sine fictione scripturarum, tractatio plenissima, neque additamentum neque ablationem recipiens, et lectio sine falsatione, et secundum scripturas expositio legitima et diligens et sine periculo et sine blasphemia, et praecipuum dilectionis munus' IV. xxxiii. 8. Cf. ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου I. xi. 1, xxviii. 1, 'suum characterem doctrinae' I. xxiv. 7, in each case of the distinctive mark of some particular heresy: so here apparently it is the successions of the bishops which are the distinctive mark of the Body of Christ.

[2] V. xx. 1: 'Eorum autem, qui ab ecclesia sunt, semita circumiens mundum universum, quippe firmam habens ab apostolis traditionem, et videre nobis donans omnium unam et eandem esse fidem, omnibus unum et eundem Deum Patrem praecipientibus, et eandem dispositionem incarnationis Filii Dei credentibus, et eandem donationem Spiritus scientibus, et eadem meditantibus praecepta, et eandem figuram eius quae est erga ecclesiam ordinationis custodientibus, et eundem exspectantibus adventum Domini, et eandem salutem totius hominis, id est animae et corporis, sustinentibus.' ('Ordinatio' translates τάξις, i.e. ecclesiastical order, in III. iii. 3.)

[3] III. iii. 1-3: 'Traditionem apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam in omni ecclesia adest perspicere omnibus qui vera velint videre; et habemus annumerare eos qui ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi in ecclesiis et successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt neque cognoverunt quale ab his deliratur. Etenim si recondita mysteria scissent apostoli quae seorsim et latenter ab reliquis perfectos docebant, his vel maxime traderent ea quibus etiam ipsas ecclesias committebant. Valde enim perfectos et irreprehensibiles in omnibus eos volebant esse quos et successores relinquebant, suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes; quibus emendate agentibus fieret magna utilitas, lapsis autem summa calamitas. Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximae et antiquissimae et omnibus cognitae, a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundatae et constitutae, ecclesiae eam quam habet ab apostolis traditionem et annuntiatam hominibus fidem, per successiones episcoporum

'All who wish to see the truth have it in their power to fix their eyes on the tradition of the Apostles, which is manifested in all the world; and we can recount the number of those who were appointed by the Apostles as bishops in the churches, and their successors down to our own time, who neither taught nor recognised any of the wild notions of these men. For had the Apostles known any mysteries which they taught to the perfect in private and unknown to the rest, they would have delivered them to those surely before all others to whom they intrusted the very churches themselves. For they desired them to be eminently perfect and utterly without reproach, whom they left behind as their actual successors, handing on to them their own teaching chair.' both in West and East,

Thus he appeals to the successors of the Apostles. Then, 'because it would be tedious in a volume like this to enumerate the successions of all the churches,' he gives that of the greatest of all, the church of Rome—a church to which he attributes a specially representative character[1]—and records how Peter and Paul intrusted the ministry of the episcopate there to Linus, and how he in turn was succeeded by Anencletus, Clement, Euarestus, Alexander, Xystus, Telesphorus the martyr, Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus,

pervenientem usque ad nos, indicantes confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo vel per sibiplacentiam malam vel vanam gloriam vel per caecitatem et malam sententiam praeterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio.' [From this point onwards the passage is preserved in the original Greek by Eusebius *H. E.* v. 6.] *θεμελιώσαντες οὖν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνῳ τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρισαν (τούτου τοῦ Λίνου Παῦλος ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολαῖς μέμνηται)· διαδέχεται δὲ αὐτὸν Ἀνέγκλητος· μετὰ τοῦτον δὲ τρίτῳ τόπῳ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν κληροῦται Κλήμης, ὁ καὶ ἑωρακὼς τοὺς μακαρίους ἀποστόλους καὶ συμβεβληκὼς αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔτι ἔναυλον τὸ κήρυγμα τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τὴν παράδοσιν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχων, οὐ μόνος· ἔτι γὰρ πολλοὶ ὑπελείποντο τότε ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων δεδιδαγμένοι . . . τὸν δὲ Κλήμεντα τοῦτον διαδέχεται Εὐάρεστος· καὶ τὸν Εὐάρεστον Ἀλέξανδρος· εἶθ' οὕτως ἕκτος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καθίσταται Ξύστος· μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Τελεσφόρος, ὃς καὶ ἐνδόξως ἐμαρτύρησεν· ἔπειτα Ὑγῖνος, εἶτα Πίος, μεθ' ὃν Ἀνίκητος. διαδεξαμένου τὸν Ἀνίκητον Σωτῆρος, νῦν δωδεκάτῳ τόπῳ τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατέχει κλῆρον Ἐλεύθερος. τῇ αὐτῇ τάξει καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ διαδοχῇ* [Euseb. διδαχῇ (but one MS. has διαδοχῇ), Lat. *successione*] *ἥ τε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παράδοσις καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας κήρυγμα κατήντηκεν εἰς ἡμᾶς.*'

[1] It seems most probable that the words of disputed meaning should be translated 'for to this church, on account of its special pre-eminence, all churches must needs come together, that is, the faithful from all sides, and in her the apostolic tradition has been always preserved by those who are *from all parts*.' I think Langen (*Gesch. der römischen Kirche* i. pp. 170-174) has made this interpretation good. But it does not concern us here.

Soter, and finally in his own day Eleutherus. Thus 'there has come down to us with the same order and the same succession the tradition from the Apostles in the Church and the preaching of the truth.' With this tradition of truth 'coming down to us through the succession of the bishops,' Irenaeus proceeds to 'confound' his opponents, corroborating, however, the tradition of the West, according to his essential principle, with the apostolic tradition of the church of Smyrna, the church of Ephesus, and 'all the churches of Asia.'[1]

What we have quoted will be enough to illustrate his method of appeal. The results of it he constantly presses on the men of his time. 'We must obey those who are the elders in the Church, those who, as we have shown, have the succession from the Apostles, who, with the succession of the episcopate, have received the sure gift of truth according to the will of the Father: but as for the rest, who leave the original succession and come together wherever it may be, them we must hold in suspicion, whether as heretics of a wrong opinion, or as men who make division through pride and self-pleasing, or again as hypocrites.'[2] 'Where one is to find [the true elders], Paul tells us when he says, "in the Church God set first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers." Where, then, the gifts of God are placed, there one should learn the truth, with those who have the Church's succession from the Apostles and maintain

[1] III. iii. 4: Πολύκαρπος . . . ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος . . . ταῦτα διδάξας ἀεὶ ἃ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔμαθεν, ἃ καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία παραδίδωσιν, ἃ καὶ μόνα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ. μαρτυροῦσι τούτοις αἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐκκλήσιαι πᾶσαι . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησία . . . μάρτυς ἀληθὴς ἐστιν τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως.

[2] IV. xxvi. 2: 'Eis qui in ecclesia sunt presbyteris oboedire oportet, his qui successionem habent ab apostolis, sicut ostendimus, qui cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris acceperunt; reliquos vero, qui absistunt a principali successione et quocumque loco colligunt, suspectos habere vel quasi haereticos et malae sententiae, vel quasi scindentes et elatos et sibi placentes, aut rursus ut hypocritas quaestus gratia et vanae gloriae hoc operantes.'

a sound and irreproachable mode of life and uncorruptness of speech.' [1]

The position of Irenaeus is thus very clear and definite. It is accepted by his more brilliant but less stable disciple, Tertullian, who reproduces his argument with striking vigour in his work called *Praescriptio* (or 'Preliminary Plea') against the Gnostic teachers. In it he has a double question to ask these pretenders to represent Christianity. First—do they hold the rule of faith? Secondly—have they an apostolic succession? 'Let them produce the account of the origins of their churches; let them unroll the line of their bishops, running down in such a way from the beginning that their first bishop shall have had for his originator and predecessor one of the Apostles, or of the apostolic men who continued to the end in the Apostles' fellowship. This is the way in which the apostolic churches report their origins: thus the church of the Smyrnaeans relates that Polycarp was installed by John, the church of the Romans relates that Clement was ordained by Peter. Just so in like manner the rest of the churches exhibit the names of the men appointed to the episcopate by Apostles, whom they possess as transmitters of the apostolic seed.' [2] 'So now' (we resume after a few chapters) 'you who wish to exercise your curiosity to better profit in the matter of your

accepted by Tertullian, c. A.D. 200;

[1] *ib.* § 5: 'Ubi igitur tales inveniat aliquis, Paulus docens ait: Posuit Deus in ecclesia primo apostolos, secundo prophetas, tertio doctores. Ubi igitur charismata Domini posita sunt, ibi discere oportet veritatem, apud quos est ea quae est ab apostolis ecclesiae successio et id quod est sanum et irreprobabile conversationis et inadulteratum et incorruptibile sermonis constat.'

[2] *de Praescr.* 32: 'Ceterum si quae [haereses] audent interserere se aetati apostolicae, ut ideo videantur ab apostolis traditae quia sub apostolis fuerunt, possumus dicere: Edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successionem ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo ecclesiae apostolicae census suos deferunt, sicut Smyrnaeorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Ioanne collocatum refert, sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum. Itidem perinde utique et ceterae exhibent quos ab apostolis in episcopatum constitutos apostolici seminis traduces habeant.'

salvation, run through the apostolic churches, where the very chairs of the Apostles still preside in their own places—Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, Rome. Make it your business to inquire what they have learned and taught!' This is his challenge.[1] The unchanging tradition goes hand in hand with the steadfast ministerial succession, just as on the contrary the novelties of heresy are associated with carelessness about order. 'Their ordinations are heedless, capricious, changeable. At one time they appoint neophytes; at another, men bound to secular employment; at another, apostates from us—so that official distinction may act as a bond to hold them, where truth cannot. Nowhere is promotion so easy as in the camp of rebels, where even one's presence is in itself a claim. And so one is a bishop to-day, another to-morrow; the reader of to-morrow is a deacon to-day; the layman of to-morrow a presbyter to-day. For they impose even on laymen the functions of the priesthood.'[2]

anticipated by Hegesippus, c. A.D. 175.

The age of Irenaeus is to be for the present our starting-point; but it is important to emphasize that there is no originality about his ecclesiastical conceptions. Not only does his own language exclude such a supposition, but we have external testimony to the

[1] *de Praescr.* 36: 'Age iam, qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuae, percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsae adhuc cathedrae apostolorum suis locis praesident, apud quas ipsae authenticae litterae eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repraesentantes faciem uniuscuiusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia? habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiae adiaces, habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas praesto est . . . Videamus quid didicerit [ecclesia Romana], quid docuerit, cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesserarit.' *ib.* 37: 'Si haec ita se habent, ut veritas nobis adiudicetur quicumque in ea regula incedimus quam ecclesia ab apostolis, apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo tradidit, constat ratio propositi nostri.'

[2] *ib.* 41: 'Ordinationes eorum temerariae, leves, inconstantes. Nunc neophytos collocant, nunc saeculo obstrictos, nunc apostatas nostros, ut gloria eos obligent, quia veritate non possunt. Nusquam facilius proficitur quam in castris rebellium, ubi ipsum esse illic promereri est. Itaque alius hodie episcopus, cras alius; hodie diaconus, qui cras lector; hodie presbyter, qui cras laicus—nam et laicis sacerdotalia munera iniungunt.'

same effect. Eusebius[1] has preserved for us some words of Hegesippus, 'the father of church history,' in which he is speaking of his journey to the West, made while Anicetus was bishop, and therefore between about 155 and 165: 'The church of the Corinthians,' he says, 'remained in the right doctrine down to Primus' episcopate in Corinth. I shared intercourse with them when I was sailing to Rome, and I passed some days with the Corinthians, in which we took comfort together in the right doctrine. And after arriving in Rome I made a succession [i.e. a list of the succession] down to Anicetus, whose deacon Eleutherus was. And from Anicetus Soter succeeds, and after him Eleutherus. Now in each succession and in each city it is as the law preaches and the prophets and the Lord.' Hegesippus then had found a succession in each city. He made a list for his own purpose at Rome; but there, as elsewhere, he had found the thing existing. Let Hegesippus' testimony then reinforce that of Irenaeus.

Starting thus from soon after the middle of the second century, the episcopal succession is an undoubted fact in all known Christian Churches. It is, however, desirable to review the evidence not only of the fact, but also of the importance attached to it. Further evidence in detail.

A. We begin with the East, and in the East with the 'cradle of our religion'—Palestine. 'As early as the middle of the second century all parties concur in representing him [James the Lord's brother] as a bishop in the strict sense of the term.'[2] The episcopate, *A.* The East. Palestine.

[1] Hegesippus ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22. 2: Ἐπέμενεν ἡ ἐκκλησία ἡ Κορινθίων ἐν τῷ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ μέχρι Πρίμου ἐπισκοπεύοντος ἐν Κορίνθῳ· οἷς συνέμιξα πλέων εἰς Ῥώμην, καὶ συνδιέτριψα τοῖς Κορινθίοις ἡμέρας ἱκανάς, ἐν αἷς συνανεπάημεν τῷ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ. γενόμενος δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ διαδοχὴν ἐποιησάμην μέχρις Ἀνικήτου, οὗ διάκονος ἦν Ἐλεύθερος· καὶ παρὰ Ἀνικήτου διαδέχεται Σωτήρ, μεθ' ὃν Ἐλεύθερος. ἐν ἑκάστῃ δὲ διαδοχῇ καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει οὕτως ἔχει, ὡς ὁ νόμος κηρύσσει καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ Κύριος.

[2] Lightfoot *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry* p. 208. See Hegesippus ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22. 4; the Clementine *Ep. Petri*, *Ep. Clem.* init., *Hom.* xi. 35; and Clem. Alex. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 1. 4. In this review of second century episcopacy I am mainly following Dr. Lightfoot.

that is to say, was at that date an institution certainly believed to derive in Jerusalem from St. James. Eusebius has preserved to us a complete list of the successors of Symeon, who was chosen in his place—first, thirteen Jewish bishops, and then, after the annihilation of Jerusalem and the foundation upon its site of Aelia Capitolina, thirteen Gentile bishops,[1] down to the accession of the venerable Narcissus: the historian accepted the Jerusalem tradition of an episcopal succession which was already ancient at the date which is for the present our starting-point.

c. A.D. 195. In the Paschal controversy we find Narcissus of Jerusalem associated with other Palestinian bishops, among whom three are specially named (those of Caesarea, Tyre, Ptolemais), in writing an encyclical letter in favour of the western view.[2] The testimony of the Clementines,[3] which may be taken to represent Ebionite ideas at some time in the third century, goes to assure us that at that date the episcopate at Caesarea, Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, Tripolis, and Laodicea could plausibly be represented as having been

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 5. 3, v. 12.

[2] Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23. 3, v. 25.

[3] The Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions* contain substantially the same narrative. They purport to preserve an account given by Clement of his connexion with St. Peter, and of St. Peter's journeyings, discourses, etc., including his institution of bishops, presbyters, and deacons at various places in Syria. Both are Ebionite, though the *Recognitions* present Ebionite ideas in a very modified form. Both are based apparently on an earlier document, and are of Syrian origin. Dr. Lightfoot says: 'The *Homilies* cannot well be placed later than the end, and should perhaps be placed before the middle, of the second century' (*Dissertation* p. 211). Dr. Salmon (*Dict. Chr. Biog.* s.v. CLEMENTINE LIT.) dates the *Recogn.* about A.D. 200 and the *Homilies* about A.D. 218: the document on which they are based may go back to A.D. 160. Dr. Hort *The Clementine Recognitions* p. 87 (1901: the lectures on which the book is based were delivered in 1884) brings down the date of the parent document to A.D. 200-220: he would apparently have brought it down later still, if he had known, what Dr. Armitage Robinson showed in his edition of the *Philocalia* (1893, p. l, p. 210), that the supposed quotation in Origen's *Commentary on Genesis* was really supplied by Basil and Gregory. Dom Chapman (*Journal of Theological Studies* iii. 436, April 1902) disputes also the quotation in Origen on St. Matthew, and places the original Clementine document in the second half of the third century.

There are also two letters to James from Peter and Clement, both now prefixed to the *Homilies*, but the latter probably served originally as preface to the *Recognitions* (*Dict. Chr. Biog.* i. p. 570). It describes St. Peter's ordination of Clement as bishop of Rome.

instituted by St. Peter.[1] It must be noticed that there is the same insistence upon the episcopal succession in the Ebionite Clementines as in the fragments of Hegesippus and in the writings of Irenaeus; episcopacy, and episcopacy derived from the Apostles, was not, we perceive, a matter of dispute.[2]

The episcopal succession at Antioch is historical at least from Ignatius. Even if we could not rely upon the list of bishops given us by Eusebius,[3] at any rate bishop Theophilus, the apologist, and bishop Serapion come out into the light before the end of the second century.

Syria, c. A.D. 115.

[1] See *Recogn.* vi. 15: '[Peter] appointed as bishop over them [at Tripolis] Maro . . . and with him he ordained twelve presbyters and deacons at the same time.' Cf. iii. 66 (Caesarea,—bishop, twelve presbyters, and four deacons), x. 68 (Laodicea); *Hom.* iii. 72 (Caesarea), vii. 5 (Tyre), 8 (Sidon), 12 (Berytus), xi. 36 (Tripolis, —bishop, twelve presbyters, and deacons), xx. 23 (Laodicea). See also *Ep. Clem. ad Iac.*

[2] It is worth while collecting the conception of the ministry given in the Clementine documents.

(1) There is the idea of succession to the Apostles. Clement succeeds St. Peter (*Ep. Clem.* 2, 19). St. Peter, in his letter to James, emphasizes the idea of succession on the analogy of the seventy elders who succeeded to 'the chair of Moses.' Here the successors seem to be the whole presbyterate, but subordination to the bishop is strongly marked (*Ep. Petr.* 1, 3). The bishop's chair is also called 'the chair of Christ' (*Ep. Clem.* 17, and *Hom.* iii. 70).

(2) The idea of the episcopal succession is mainly that of succession to the teaching office, in order to keep the tradition (cf. Irenaeus): see *Ep. Clem.* 2, 6: ἡ τῶν λόγων καθέδρα, ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας προκαθεζόμενος, ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας πρεσβύτης. But the bishop has intrusted to him 'the authority to bind and loose' with divine sanction (*ib.* 2: αὐτῷ μεταδίδωμι τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ δεσμεύειν καὶ λύειν, ἵνα περὶ παντὸς οὗ ἂν χειροτονήσῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδογματισμένον ἐν οὐρανοῖς: cf. *ib.* 6, *Hom.* iii. 72); he is the προεστώς (*Ep. Clem.* 6); he has the general administration of the Church (διοίκησις, *ib.* 3, etc.); he is to be kept clear from secular cares (*ib.* 5, 6).

(3) Presbyters are to exercise moral discipline; to administer charitable relief; to reconcile disputants (*Ep. Clem.* 7-10; *Hom.* iii. 67, 68). The deacons are 'the eyes of the bishop,' to assist his pastoral care in the distribution of alms, with considerable independence in the latter department (*Ep. Clem.* 12; *Hom.* iii. 67). There is also mention of catechists, but the bishop is represented in one place as the catechist (*Ep. Clem.* 13, 14). The Ship of the Church is described elaborately with her full equipment of officers, etc. (*ib.* 14, 15).

(4) Ordination is by laying on of hands (*Ep. Clem.* 19; *Hom.* iii. 72; *Recogn.* iii. 66), with accompanying prayer (*Hom.* iii. 72).

In all this there is nothing specially Ebionite; but James is called 'bishop of bishops,' and has a universal authority ascribed to him (*Ep. Clem.* init.). Even Peter, though he is called 'first of apostles' (*ib.* 1), has to give an annual account to him of his doings (*Recogn.* 1, 17), and is subject to him (*ib.* 72). This is Ebionite.

[3] Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 20, 24; v. 22. It is not unlikely that Eusebius derived the list of early bishops both of Antioch and of Alexandria (see p. 115 n.[6] *infra*) from the *Chronicle* of Julius Africanus, A.D. 218.

So much for the Church of Palestine and the Greek Church of Syria. Of the early 'Syrian Church, strictly so-called'—the Syriac-speaking Church—we have no authentic history. It is, however, worth while noticing that the early traditions of that Church represent the 'ordination to the priesthood' as the means of the propagation of the Gospel, venerate the threefold ministry as of apostolic institution, and lay great stress on the episcopal succession derived in each church from an apostle through the laying on of hands.[1]

Asia Minor. A.D. 110-115.

We pass from Syria to 'Asia' to find the episcopal succession a very old established institution. It is enough to say that Ignatius had impressed upon the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, that the bishop, with the presbyters and deacons, represents the authority of God, and we are not allowed to doubt that at least

[1] See *The Teaching of Addaeus the Apostle* and *The Teaching of the Apostles*—ancient Syriac documents, trans. in Clark's Ante-Nicene Library, vol. xx.—esp. pp. 32, 48: cf. Tixeront *Origines de l'église d'Edesse* pp. 114 ff.: Duval *Anciennes Littératures chrétiennes: La Littérature syriaque* pp. 102 ff. The *Teaching of Addai* is a retouched version, dating apparently from about 400 A.D., of the document quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 13), which existed in 'the archives of Edessa, at that time a royal city.' The *Teaching of the Apostles* is a Syriac version of a Greek *Didascalia* produced in Syria in the course of the third century, which underlies the first six books of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (see p. 131); but the version itself must be early, since it uses an old pre-Peshitta Syriac reading. As to their ecclesiastical ideas, it may be noted that the bishop is called by a word translated 'guide and ruler.' Addaeus, the apostle, ordains Aggaeus, and he 'made priests and guides in the whole country of Mesopotamia.' The authority of the guide is limited: 'it is not lawful for him to transact the affairs of the Church apart from those who minister with him' (*Teaching of the Apostles* p. 41). Cf. Lightfoot *Dissertation* p. 211 n.6.

It should be noticed that the apostles who originate 'ordination to the priesthood' (*Teaching of the Apostles* p. 48) are reckoned at *seventy-two*, and amongst them are Luke and Addaeus, whom Eusebius calls Thaddaeus and describes as 'one of the seventy disciples of Christ' (*H. E.* i. 13. 4). The number seventy-two represents the older Syriac reading of St. Luke x. 1; the Peshitta has 'seventy.' (On the relations of the Old Syr. to the Pesh. see Westcott and Hort *Introd. to N. T.* pp. 84, 85; and Prof. Burkitt's works *S. Ephraim's quotations from the Gospel* [*Texts and Studies* vii. 2] 1901, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* vol. ii. 1904). Seventy-two is also the number given in the Syriac Acts of Thomas, in the Syriac *History of John the Son of Zebedee* (Wright Apocryphal Acts ii. 23, 151), and in the Commentary of Ephraem Syrus in the Diatessaron—an Armenian version of a Syriac original. But it is also common in the West, and is the reading both of the Old Latin and the Vulgate. Lastly it is read in the Codex Vaticanus (B). It is therefore not unlikely that the Old Syriac witnesses represent the original Greek text.

they learned the lesson. Besides Polycarp of Smyrna, Onesimus of Ephesus, Damas of Magnesia, and Polybius of Tralles, whom Ignatius mentions, we hear during the second century of two bishops of Hierapolis, Papias, an elder contemporary of Polycarp, and Claudius Apollinaris; of Thraseas, bishop of Eumenia; Sagaris, bishop of Laodicea; and Melito, bishop of Sardis.[1] Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus at the end of the second century, speaks of himself as having had seven of his own family before him in the episcopate, whose traditions he followed.[2] About the same date we hear of bishops at Apamea and at the village of Comana or Coumana.[3] If we pass from the proconsular province to Asia Minor in the wider sense of the term, we have not much evidence bearing on the subject; but we hear of bishops in the second century at Sinope[4] and at Amastris;[5] and there is no indication such as would lead us to doubt the universal extension of the episcopate in the churches of that country. Towards the end of the century episcopal synods become common; at the time of the Paschal controversy there were a number of bishops in Pontus; and Polycrates speaks of 'great

[1] Claudius was dead when Serapion (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 19. 2) wrote, c. 200 A.D.: Thraseas, Sagaris, and Melito were dead when Polycrates (*ib.* v. 24. 4, 5) wrote, c. 195 A.D.; Sagaris according to Melito (*ib.* iv. 26. 3) was martyred in the proconsulship of 'Servilius Paullus'—probably Sergius Paullus, proconsul of Asia c. 165 A.D. Papias presumably called himself bishop of Hierapolis in his book on the *Explanation of the Oracles of the Lord*: Eusebius regularly speaks of him as 'the bishop of Hierapolis' (*H. E.* ii. 15. 2, iii. 36. 2; *Chron.* Olympiad 219. 4).

[2] Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24. 6.

[3] Zoticos of Comana and Julianus of Apamea are mentioned by the anonymous contemporary adversary of the Montanists (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 16. 17) in a treatise addressed to one Avircius Marcellus: this Avircius is probably identical with Abercius bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia, whose epitaph was rediscovered by Sir W. M. Ramsay: see Lightfoot *Ignatius* i. 477-483.

[4] Marcion of Sinope is described as 'episcopi filius' in [*adv. Omn. Haer.* appended to] Tertull. *de Praescr.* 51. Marcion propagated his system before the middle of the second century. He was himself recognised as bishop by his sect and organized it on the Church's model; 'faciunt favos et vespae, faciunt ecclesias et Marcionitae' (Tertull. *adv. Marc.* iv. 5).

[5] Palmas of Amastris is mentioned by Dionysius of Corinth writing to the churches of Pontus (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23. 6).

crowds' of bishops whom he had summoned to conference on that subject.[1]

Greece.

If there is less evidence of the diffusion of episcopacy in Greece in the latter half of the second century, this probably does not mean more than that the Church there was less prominent than the Church in Asia.[2] Where we hear of church government it is episcopal. Tertullian speaks of 'councils,' in which representatives from all the churches met at fixed centres for the common discussion of matters of importance, as characteristic of the Greek provinces.[3] At Corinth, when Hegesippus visited it, there was not only a bishop, Primus, but a succession;[4] after him we hear of Dionysius, and at the time of the Paschal controversy of Bacchyllus.[5] In the mention which Eusebius makes of a letter of Dionysius 'to the Athenians' (about A.D. 170), we hear of at least two bishops in the succession of Athens prior to that date—Publius, who was martyred, and Quadratus, who had recalled their church from something like 'apostasy from the word,' into which they had fallen.[6] It is doubtful whether this bishop can be identified with that Quadratus whom Eusebius records to have presented his Apology to Hadrian at Athens.[7] But if Dionysius did, as Eusebius says he did, describe his namesake the Areopagite as the first bishop of Athens, he must have believed the episcopate there to go back to the apostolic age.[8]

c. A.D. 160-165.

Macedonia.

We have the names of no bishops on contemporary evidence during the second century in Macedonia,

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23. 3, 24. 8.

[2] The problems presented by the Epistles of Clement and Polycarp will be considered below, pp. 284, 288. They do not fall within this period.

[3] Tert. *de Ieiuniis* 13.

[4] Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22. 2. After speaking specially of the Corinthian and Roman churches, Hegesippus proceeds with the phrase 'in each succession and in each city . . .'

[5] Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23. 1; v. 22, 23. 4.

[6] Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23. 3. Publius is called ὁ προεστὼς αὐτῶν.

[7] The question is discussed in *Texts and Studies* vol. i. No. 1 pp. 10 ff.

[8] Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 4. 10; iv. 23. 3.

but when Tertullian is rhetorically bidding the heretical teachers to take counsel of 'the apostolic churches, where the very chairs of the Apostles still preside,' he goes on, 'Is Achaia nearest to you? you have Corinth; if you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi, you have Thessalonica,'—showing that at the end of the century Macedonia had episcopal successions which were believed to be derived from apostolic ordination.[1]

Thrace.

If we pass from Macedonia to Thrace we pass to a district almost without Christian record, but towards the end of the century we find a bishop of Develtum signing an encyclical letter directed against the Montanists,[2] and 'the existence of a see at a place so unimportant implies the wide spread of episcopacy in these regions.'[3]

Crete.

On our passage from Greece to Egypt we may take Crete by the way. There we know that at least two episcopal sees existed about A.D. 170, for Dionysius of Corinth wrote a letter 'to the Cnossians,' with words of advice to Pinytus their bishop, and another 'to the church at Gortyna, with the other parishes [i.e. dioceses] in Crete,' specially commending Philip, the bishop of Gortyna, who is also known as the author of a work against Marcion.[4]

Alexandria.

On arriving at Alexandria we shall undoubtedly find ourselves in a church of the three orders. It is true that we cannot trace to its source or verify the complete and dated list of Alexandrian bishops, which Eusebius gives us, reaching back to St. Mark as founder of the church.[5] We do not in fact know

[1] Tertull. *de Praescr.* 36. Cf. Origen on Rom. xvi. 23: 'fertur sane traditione maiorum quod hic Gaius [St. Paul's host] primus episcopus fuerit Thessalonicensis ecclesiae.'

[2] Euseb. *H. E.* v. 19. 3.

[3] Lightfoot *Dissertation* p. 217.

[4] Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23. 5, 7, 25.

[5] Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 24 (Mark, Annianus); iii. 14 (Abilius), 21 (Cerdo); iv. 1 (Primus), etc. The list may well have come from the chronicler Julius Africanus; see above p. 111 n.[3].

the *name* of any Alexandrian bishop on indisputable evidence till we get to Demetrius, Origen's contemporary; for 'the Alexandrian succession, in which history is hitherto most interested, is not the succession of the bishops but of the heads of the catechetical school.'[1] But Clement's evidence gives us all that we want. He was born about the middle of the second century, and not only had the Church which he knew bishops, presbyters, and deacons,[2] but it

The existence of bishops at Alexandria indisputable;

[1] Lightfoot *Disseration* p. 226.

[2] 'The grades in the Church here of bishops, presbyters, deacons, I believe to be imitations of the angelic glory' (*Strom.* vi. 13. 107; αἱ ἐνταῦθα κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν προκοπαὶ ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, μιμήματα οἶμαι ἀγγελικῆς δόξης). The whole chapter runs thus:—The perfect Christian gnostic is even here equal to the angels: he may be made equal to the Apostles: 'not that they became apostles because they were elect for some special peculiarity of nature, for Judas was chosen with them; but they were capable of becoming apostles on being chosen by Him who foresaw even how they would end. For Matthias, who was not chosen with them, on showing himself fit (ἄξιος) to become an apostle, is substituted for Judas. So now too, those who have exercised themselves in the Lord's commandments and have lived perfectly and with knowledge (γνωστικῶς), according to the Gospel, may be included (ἐγγραφῆναι) in the election of the Apostles. Such an one is in reality a presbyter of the Church and a true deacon of the will of God, if he do and teach the things of the Lord, not being ordained (χειροτονούμενος) by man, nor reckoned just because he is a presbyter, but counted (καταλεγόμενος) in the presbyterate because he is just. And even if here upon earth he be not honoured with the chief seat (πρωτοκαθεδρία), he will sit on the four and twenty thrones judging the people, as John says in the Apocalypse.' The four and twenty elders, he continues, are the chosen of the chosen, equally from Jews or Greeks. 'For I think the grades in the Church here of bishops, presbyters, deacons are imitations of the angelic glory and of that dispensation (οἰκονομίας) which the Scriptures say awaits those who, following the footsteps of the Apostles, have lived in perfection of righteousness according to the Gospel. For these, the Apostle writes, "lifted up in the clouds" will serve their diaconate first (διακονήσειν), then be enrolled in the presbyterate in a higher grade of glory, for glory differeth from glory, until they grow up into a perfect man.' Clement's meaning is apparently that moral excellence and gnostic enlightenment were qualifications for the apostolate of old and make a man a true priest now (cf. the exclamation of the people in demanding Athanasius' election 'ἀληθῶς ἐπίσκοπος,' Athan. *Apol. c. Ar.* 6); not, however, in the sense that they can enable a man to dispense with ordination or justify him in assuming ministerial functions without it, but only in the sense that, if he be not admitted to the clergy here, he will be hereafter raised to those grades of glory which the present distinctive offices in the Church adumbrate here below; they are titles for a place in the hierarchy *in heaven, if not here.* It will be noticed that though Clement divides the hierarchy into three orders, he can still (like Origen and many others) speak of the presbyterate as 'the chief seat' (§ 106): the *main* distinction with him, as with Irenaeus and many after them, is between presbyters and deacons. Thus in another passage (*Strom.* vii. 1. 3), contrasting the two sorts of ministry to men—the more menial service (ὑπηρετική) and the higher ministry of improvement (βελτιωτικὴ θεραπεία)—he finds the former exemplified in the Church's diaconate, the latter in the presbyterate, thus dividing the church ministry into *two* sorts (ὁμοίως κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν μὲν βελτιωτικὴν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι σώζουσιν εἰκόνα, τὴν ὑπηρετικὴν δὲ οἱ διάκονοι); here the presbyterate must include the bishop.

had even passed out of memory that 'bishop' and 'presbyter' were interchangeable titles in St. Paul's days.[1]

but Jerome reports

There is thus no ground for doubting the existence of an episcopal succession at Alexandria in the middle of the second century.[2] But we have it on Jerome's evidence that this succession had some peculiarity. He is writing[3] in a state of great indignation with the arrogance of deacons in the church of Rome.

Clement's position on many points is somewhat hard to define. His line of thought is not one which, like that of Irenaeus, leads him to speak much about the ministry. At the same time there is an intellectualism in his whole conception of religion, a recognition of a 'priesthood of knowledge' (for refs. see Bigg *B. L.* p. 101 [ed. 2 pp. 134, 135]), which represents an opposite tendency to the 'priesthood of enthusiasm' among the Montanists. This, we must acknowledge—whatever fascination Clement's gentle, pious, generous spirit has for us—had in it dangerous elements of Gnosticism, and led him even to shrink from attributing to our Lord real human feelings, a real flesh and blood like ours (Bigg *B. L.* pp. 93, 71 n.[6] [ed. 2 pp. 126, 102 n.[2]]); it makes him in a measure depreciate mere faith, and desire to create 'a Church within a Church,' a Church of the spiritually enlightened (Bigg p. 85 f. [ed. 2 p. 117]). Thus it *may* have tended to make him depreciate the ministry which comes of ordination by comparison with the priesthood of knowledge, but there is no evidence of this. His point of view is not at all *unecclesiastical*. Christianity is not by any means to him a mere idea or philosophy; it is embodied in a visible society. Nor in the passage quoted is there anything to lead us to suppose that he shrank from recognising the necessity for orders in the Church, or their exclusive rights, any more than he shrank from recognising the exclusive prerogative of the Church. Dr. Bigg says no more than is true when he says: 'It is important to add . . . that Clement lays great stress upon the observance of the existing church discipline, the regular use of all the ordinary means of grace' (pp. 96, 97 [ed. 2 p. 130]). He very likely, however, did not recognise fully that 'the unworthiness of the minister hinders not the grace of the sacraments,' and he speaks of baptism administered by heretics as οὐκ οἰκεῖον καὶ γνήσιον ὕδωρ (*Strom.* i. 19. 96). On this, and on his not using sacerdotal language of the ministry, see below pp. 176 f., 180 f.

[1] *Paed.* iii. 12. 97: 'there are an infinite number of suggestions in the sacred books directed to select persons, some to presbyters, some to bishops and deacons, others to widows.'

[2] We should have some additional reason to believe that the episcopate was recognised at Alexandria as distinct from the presbyterate very early in the century, if the letter in which the emperor Hadrian, who visited Alexandria in A.D. 130, gives an account of his visit in writing to the consul Servianus could be accepted as genuine. Amidst the motley crowd of the devotees of all sorts of religions and superstitions, whose fickle inconsistency, as it appeared in his eyes, half amused and half disgusted him, he recognises the 'bishops of Christ' as distinct figures from the Christian presbyters. His words are as follows: 'Illic qui Serapim colunt Christiani sunt, et devoti sunt Serapi qui Christi se episcopos dicunt. Nemo illic archisynagogus Iudaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter, non mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes. Ipse ille patriarcha, cum Aegyptum venerit, ab aliis Serapidem adorare, ab aliis cogitur Christum.' The 'patriarcha' is (no doubt) the Jewish patriarch. Lightfoot (*Dissertation* p. 225, *Ignatius* i. 464) accepts the letter as genuine: Mommsen *Provinces of the Roman Empire* E.T. ii. 256 n. decisively rejects it.

[3] *Ep.* cxlvi. *ad Evangelum.*

He (like other patristic writers of his time) wishes to emphasize, as a corrective to their self-assertion, the especial dignity of that priesthood which, with some highly important differences of function, presbyter and bishop share in common. His view will be considered later, but he illustrates it by a practice which he attributes to the church of Alexandria in earlier days, and with this illustration we are now concerned.

that down to A.D. 233-265 the bishops were constituted by mere election.

Jerome then asserts that 'from the days of St. Mark the Evangelist down to the episcopates of Heraclas and Dionysius the presbyters at Alexandria used always to appoint as bishop one chosen out of their number and placed upon the higher grade, just as if an army were to make the general, or deacons were to choose one of themselves whose diligence they knew and call him archdeacon. For what' (he asks) 'except ordination does a bishop do which a presbyter does not?'[1] The language of this statement is ambiguous, but Jerome seems to mean, as he was certainly understood to mean by later Latin writers, that there was no fresh consecration or ordination required in earlier days at Alexandria to make a presbyter bishop, but that he became bishop simply in virtue of his election by the other presbyters. There would thus have been a substantial identity between the two orders.

Evidence cited in support of Jerome's statement:

Now what other evidence is there in support of this statement of Jerome's? Jerome's influence was so great on the writers of the Carolingian age that they incorporated his assertions into their own treatises on church offices without hesitation,[2] but their agreement with him of course does not add any weight. Five witnesses, however, who may be reasonably supposed to have been independent of Jerome, have been adduced as bearing testimony

[1] The Latin is quoted in App. Note B, where there is some further discussion of the matter.

[2] See references in App. Note B, p. 315.

either in general to an original right of presbyters in Egypt to ordain, or to a particular right of the presbyters at Alexandria to appoint and consecrate their patriarch. Of these the two who are thought to point to the survival in Egypt of sporadic indications of the presbyter's right to ordain may be dismissed very shortly: in one case the reference is to confirmation not ordination, in the other case the ordaining presbyter claimed to be a bishop.

1. Ambrosiaster, c. 375 A.D.

1. Lightfoot quotes Ambrosiaster, the elder contemporary of Jerome, as saying in his *Commentary on the Pauline Epistles* (Eph. iv. 12) that 'in Egypt the presbyters seal (i.e. ordain or consecrate) if the bishop be not present'; and the only point he himself raises is whether the reference is 'to the ordination of presbyters and not to the consecration of a bishop.' In a note he cites the Latin of the parallel passage in the same author's *Questions on the Old and New Testament* (ci. 5), 'Nam in Alexandria et per totam Aegyptum, si desit episcopus consecrat (v.l. consignat) presbyter.'[1] It would seem as though the two words *consecrare* and *consignare* are treated as synonyms, both of them meaning 'to ordain,' whereas in fact it is doubtful if *consecrare* without further definition would mean 'consecrate' in the sense of 'ordain,' and certain that *consignare* can mean nothing but 'confirm.' And *consecrare* has no sort of claim to be considered the true reading: it is not even mentioned in the apparatus to the critical text of the *Quaestiones*.[2] What then Ambrosiaster tells us that the presbyters did in Egypt, in the bishop's absence, was to confirm. Even so he does not suggest that a presbyter could consecrate the chrism.[3]

[1] *Dissertation* p. 231.

[2] Vol. 50 of the Vienna Corpus of Latin Church writers; edited by Prof. A. Souter of Aberdeen.

[3] Didymus, who lived and taught at Alexandria, and was Jerome's own teacher, says quite absolutely: ἐπίσκοπος μόνος τῇ ἄνωθεν χάριτι τελεῖ τὸ χρῖσμα (*de Trin.* ii. 15).

2. The case of Ischyras.

2. At some point not many years before the council of Nicaea 'one Ischyras was deprived of his orders because he had been ordained by a presbyter only': [1] and it has been suggested that the mere fact of such an ordination having occurred is a sign that the older traditions of the substantial identity of the bishop and the presbyter still survived in the byways of the Egyptian Church. But Athanasius' language, or rather the language he quotes from official letters of the years 335-340 A.D., does not countenance this. 'How then is Ischyras a presbyter? Who appointed him? Colluthus, was it not? This is the only plea left. But that Colluthus died a presbyter, and that his every ordination is invalid, and that all who were appointed by him in the schism have come out laymen and communicate on those terms, *is plain and nobody doubts it.*' [2] 'Ischyras was ordained by the presbyter Colluthus, who imagined himself to be a bishop and who was later on re-admitted by the synod under Hosius to his original grade of presbyter.' [3] In fact there is not the least reason to suppose that Colluthus claimed to ordain as a presbyter: on the contrary he claimed to ordain as a bishop, but as he had only been a presbyter in the Church, and was made a bishop, and performed ordinations as a bishop, 'in the schism,' he himself when reconciled to the Church was treated as what

[1] Lightfoot *Dissertation* p. 232 n.[1].

[2] Athan. *Apol. c. Ar.* 11, 12 (quoting from a synodical letter of Egyptian bishops, A.D. 339 or 340): οὗτος δέ ἐστιν ὁ πολυθρύλλητος Ἰσχύρας, ὁ μήτε ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας χειροτονηθεὶς καί, ὅτε τοὺς ὑπὸ Μελετίου κατασταθέντας πρεσβυτέρους Ἀλέξανδρος ἐδέχετο, μηδὲ ἐκείνοις συναριθμηθείς· οὕτως οὐδὲ ἐκεῖθεν κατεστάθη. πόθεν οὖν πρεσβύτερος Ἰσχύρας; τίνος καταστήσαντος; ἆρα Κολλούθου; τοῦτο γὰρ λοιπόν. ἀλλ' ὅτι Κόλλουθος πρεσβύτερος ὢν ἐτελεύτησε, καὶ πᾶσα χεὶρ αὐτοῦ γέγονεν ἄκυρος καὶ πάντες οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ κατασταθέντες ἐν τῷ σχίσματι λαϊκοὶ γεγόνασι καὶ οὕτω συνάγονται, δῆλον, καὶ οὐδενὶ καθέστηκεν ἀμφίβολον. Cf. *ib.* 74 (Letter of Mareotic clergy, A.D. 335, to council of Tyre): Ἰσχύρας οὐδέποτε λειτουργὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας γέγονεν . . . ἐκπεσὼν καὶ τῆς ψευδοῦς ὑπονοίας τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου.

[3] See *Apol. c. Ar. c.* 76 (quoting Letter of Mareotic clergy, A.D. 335, to civil authorities): ὑπὸ γὰρ Κολλούθου τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου φαντασθέντος ἐπισκοπήν, καὶ ὕστερον ὑπὸ κοινῆς συνόδου Ὁσίου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐπισκόπων κελευσθέντος πρεσβυτέρου εἶναι, καθὸ καὶ πρότερον ἦν, κατεστάθη,

he was before his schism, namely a presbyter, and similarly those whom he had ordained were treated on reconciliation as what they had been before the schism, namely laymen. Everything that was done in schism was null and void: we have only to remember how strongly the current of feeling ran in early times against allowing any validity whatever to orders conferred and received outside the Church, and the whole matter becomes as simple as possible. No other interpretation really squares with the testimony of the documents.

In regard then to any general right to ordain residing in Egyptian presbyters, the evidence comes to nothing at all: there is more substance in the witnesses who seem to confirm Jerome in the particular matter of the appointment of the Alexandrian patriarch, and to these we must now turn. One of them, the Arabic-speaking patriarch Eutychius, was cited as long ago as by Selden: but Eutychius' date is so remote from the times of which he treats—he wrote in the middle of the tenth century—that, as we have no means of controlling his story by knowledge of his sources, it seems best to cite and examine him at length in an appendix.[1] The other two pieces of evidence have been brought to light since the first edition of this book was published: they are drawn respectively from the sayings of the Fathers of the desert and from the correspondence of the great Monophysite writer Severus.

(Eutychius see App. B.)

3. The *Apophthegmata*, or 'table-talk' as we may put it, of the Egyptian Fathers are made up in large part of early and trustworthy traditions, and there is every reason to accept as genuine the saying[2] told

3. Poemen and his visitors, c. 370 A.D.

[1] App. Note B, p. 315 ff.

[2] Disinterred from the collections of Apophthegms by abbot Butler in his edition of the *Lausiac History* of Palladius (*Texts and Studies* vi. part 1 [Cambridge 1898] p. 213).

of abbot Poemen: 'Once on a time there came certain heretics to Poemen and began to disparage the archbishop of Alexandria as having received his ordination at the hands of presbyters. The old man answered not a word, but he called his brother and said, "Lay the table and give them dinner and send them off in peace."' The archbishop intended is no doubt Athanasius; Athanasius did not die till 373, and it was not very many years after that date that Rufinus visited Poemen among other celebrated Egyptian ascetics.[1] It was apparently assumed by the narrator of the Apophthegm that Poemen had a good answer to give, since otherwise there would have been no merit of humility in his silence, and it is as an example of humility that he is here cited. But what the answer would have been, if it had been given, we are not told.

4. Severus of Antioch, c. 530 A.D.

4. Severus was intruded as patriarch of Antioch in 512, but on the accession of the Emperor Justin in 518 he was expelled and fled to Alexandria, which became his headquarters for the remainder of his life. He devoted great learning and incessant activity to the purpose of organizing the different elements of the Monophysite party into a coherent and united body. His collected letters were arranged in no less than twenty-three books, and amounted to some four thousand in all: one book, the sixth, of a selection made out of this total has survived in a Syriac version, and has now been made accessible in an English translation by Mr. E. W. Brooks.[2] Among the letters thus preserved is one addressed to 'the orthodox in Emesa,' in

[1] *Hist. Eccl.* xi. 8. The *Dictionary of Christian Biography* iv. 421 is therefore wrong in reckoning Poemen's monastic life as late as 390-460 A.D.

[2] From British Museum MSS. Add. 12181 and 14600, both of the eighth century: see *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus patriarch of Antioch in the Syriac version of Athanasius of Nisibis*, edited and translated by E. W. Brooks (Text and Translation Society: Text 2 vols. Translation 2 vols.), 1902-1904.

which the claim of a certain Isaiah to be a bishop is examined and refuted. Isaiah had appeared in Emesa and had there performed ordinations and consecrations: when asked, however, for proof of his episcopal character, he could neither name any see nor any consecrator except one who was dead. But the Nicene canons demanded a larger number of consecrators and a fuller guarantee of their authority to act, and it was no use to quote against this a canon of Simon the Cananaean,[1] permitting under certain circumstances consecration by one bishop, since earlier regulations must give way to 'enactments carefully made at a later date.' So St. Cyprian's rule of re-baptizing all heretics without distinction may not now be enforced against more recent usage. 'The bishop also of the city, renowned for its orthodox faith, of the Alexandrines was in old times appointed by presbyters: but in modern times, in accordance with the canon which has prevailed everywhere, the solemn institution of their bishop is performed by bishops, and no one makes light of the accurate practice that prevails in the holy churches and recurs to the earlier condition of things, which has given way to the later clear and accurate, deliberate and spiritual injunctions.'[2]

So far as this evidence of Severus goes it clearly supports Jerome. Severus was living in Egypt, and he was an educated and erudite writer: so that we can conclude with certainty that it was believed at Alexandria in the early years of the sixth century that the Alexandrian presbyters had at some time in the past 'appointed,' that is presumably 'ordained,' their bishop. This being so, it would be unreasonable to deny credence to Jerome for the existence of the same tradition in Alexandria a century earlier.

[1] This is really § 27 of the 8th book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the regulation being there put into the mouth of Simon.

[2] *op. cit.* Translation vol. i. p. 213.

But we are by no means done with the difficulties when we have got so far.

The earliest assertion of appointment or ordination of the patriarch by presbyters

The evidence of Jerome takes us back at least to the beginning of the fifth century: [1] but the evidence of Poemen is a generation earlier still. The story of the abbot and the heretics is at once so naïve and so precise that we cannot doubt that we have here a true picture of an event that actually happened, an assertion that was actually made about the presbyterian ordination of the patriarch. Yet we know beyond question that this, the earliest statement about the exercise of the prerogative of the Alexandrian presbyters, is a statement contrary to fact. Athanasius was not elected and not consecrated by presbyters. It is true that the Eusebian party at a very early date objected to his appointment as uncanonical: but the objection was that he had been elected by a handful of people, and consecrated in a hole-and-corner way by a mere half-dozen bishops. In answer to the Eusebian charges, the encyclical of the whole body of Egyptian bishops in the year 339 emphasizes the regularity and unanimity of the proceedings in respect both of election and of consecration. 'All the multitude, and all the plebs of the catholic church, collected as one mind and body, kept on with shouts and cries demanding Athanasius as bishop for the church: for this they openly prayed Christ, this they adjured us to effect, and for several days and nights they would neither leave the church themselves nor suffer us to do so. Of this we can bear witness, and so can the whole city and the province. They said nothing (contrary to what the Eusebians allege) against him; what they did call him was everything that was best, "earnest," "religious," "christian," "ascetic," "an ideal bishop." And that the larger

demonstrably false.

[1] Jerome's *Ep.* cxlvi. *ad Evangelum* is of uncertain date: perhaps of the end of the fourth century.

number of ourselves consecrated him under the eyes of the people and to the accompaniment of their applause, we are again witnesses and, being the consecrators, the best witnesses possible.'[1]

This is the first record that history gives us of the circumstances attendant upon the ordination of a particular patriarch of Alexandria; and, quite obviously, it has no contact at all with the procedure as described by Jerome or Severus or Eutychius. There is a good deal about the people, and a good deal about the bishops, but nothing about the presbyters. If Poemen had cared for controverting the heretics who visited him, his task would have been an easy one. But if it had not happened that this encyclical had been preserved, how strong would have seemed the grounds for supposing, on the evidence of the Apophthegm, that presbyterian consecration had lasted till the days of Athanasius. As it is, we can only conclude that the assertion of the 'certain heretics' was one more of the countless Arian slanders directed against Athanasius.

Now if the earliest statement about presbyterian ordination at Alexandria is thus shown to be incorrect, the later statements to the same general effect are no longer as weighty as they would otherwise be. It is true that Severus expresses himself vaguely about 'old times,' and that Jerome is cautious enough to throw back the cessation of the presbyterian state of things a century and more before his own day. But if we know that by Arian controversialists it was urged as an argument against Athanasius that he had been consecrated by presbyters, and that the allegation was false—if we remember further what a wide circulation Arian literature must have enjoyed in the East from the reign of Constantine to the reign of Theodosius—

[1] ap. Athanasius *Apologia contra Arianos* 6.

the suspicion arises that the historical statements of Jerome, Severus, and Eutychius may be all versions more or less distorted of a single original document, an original dating somewhere about the middle of the fourth century, and not unconnected with the campaign of incessant warfare carried on under Constantius (337-361) against the great patriarch of Alexandria.

Of course it would still remain possible and likely that there was some sort of historical nucleus to give plausibility to the allegation, demonstrably false as it was in regard to the bishop at whom it was aimed. To test this possibility we can only turn to such evidence as is available for Alexandria during the ante-Nicene period: and in this connexion the life and writings of Origen are of primary importance.[1] His language and his silence are both significant.

Ante-Nicene evidence:

Origen had suffered severely from specially episcopal authority at Alexandria. He had been ordained presbyter, as is well known, at Caesarea, without the consent of Demetrius, the bishop of Alexandria. Now, while a mixed synod of Egyptian bishops and presbyters had consented only to banish him for this breach of canonical discipline, a synod of *bishops alone* had gone further and deposed him from his presbyterate—as he and his friends thought, unjustly.[2] He did not finally leave Alexandria till A.D. 231, when he was about forty-five. All this time the Alexandrian bishop differed (if Jerome's account be true) from the presbyters in honour and office, not in essential order. Not more than two years after he had left, Heraclas, his old pupil and friend, became

Origen's witness unfavourable to Jerome's view.

[1] Mention may also be made of Epiphanius, Jerome's older contemporary and bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, who knew Egypt as well as Jerome. He is acquainted (*Haer.* lxix. 1: p. 315 *infra*) with the peculiar position of the Alexandrian presbyters, which anticipated that of the parish priests of later days—Arius, for instance, was in charge of the church and quarter of Baucalis—but if he had known of any right on their part to ordain the patriarch he would presumably have had to explain it in his refutation of the presbyterian theories of Aerius: see pp. 147 f.

[2] See p. 318. Cf. *Dict. Chr. Biog.* s.v. ORIGEN (iv. p. 100).

bishop in succession to Demetrius, and (again according to Jerome) the separate ordination of the Alexandrian bishop and his consequent differentiation from the presbyters began—i.e., presumably, was provided for, and carried into effect at the ordination of his successor Dionysius, c. A.D. 248. Origen therefore, on this hypothesis, had intimate experience of a gradual change resulting in the clear differentiation at Alexandria of the episcopate from the presbyterate. At the same time he had every reason for scanning with some jealousy the exaltation of the bishop: nor does he elsewhere show any disposition to spare bishops castigation which he thinks well merited. Moreover, such a change in ecclesiastical status could hardly be carried through without some amount of jealousy or friction. Yet writing against Celsus about the time of Heraclas' death and Dionysius' succession, he compares 'ecclesiae of God' with the civil 'ecclesiae' at Athens, Corinth, and Alexandria; he compares for each city the archon (bishop), the councillors (presbyters), and the people; he finds the Christian Churches characterized by 'mildness and stability': if fault is to be found with some of the Christian 'councillors or archons,' it is because they are found to lead indolent lives compared with some of their more energetic fellows.[1] Neither here nor elsewhere—and Origen often alludes to bishops and presbyters [2]—does he give any hint that bishops were

[1] *c. Cels.* iii. 30.

[2] Origen's language about church offices is of this nature:—

(1) Bishops and presbyters are classed together as τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας πεπιστευμένοι or ἐν ἐκκλησιαστικῇ δοκοῦντες εἶναι ὑπεροχῇ (*in Matt.* xvi. 22, *in Ioann.* xxxii. 7 [12]). (So later Dionysius of Alexandria speaks of 'my fellow-presbyter' ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 5. 6 and 11. 3.) [But while deacons are excluded from this class in the passage *in Matt.* xvi. 22 (those that buy and sell are laity, the money-changers are deacons, those that sell doves are bishops and presbyters), in an earlier passage of the same commentary, *in Matt.* xiv. 22, they are included with bishops and presbyters among the ἐκκλησιαστικαὶ ἀρχαί.]

(2) Much more frequently they are spoken of as constituting *distinct* classes; cf. *in Luc.* xx.: 'Si Iesus Filius Dei subicitur Ioseph et Mariae, ego non subiciar episcopo qui mihi a Deo ordinatus est pater? Non subiciar presbytero qui mihi Domini dignatione praepositus est?' He distinguishes, *in Exod.* xi. 6, those 'ui

exalting their order at the expense of presbyters.[1] Indeed he assumes for the episcopate a completely stable and traditional position clearly distinct from the presbyterate. Further in his homilies on Numbers (after A.D. 244) when he is desiring a more religious method of appointing bishops than was customary, he speaks of bishops nominating their successors (and giving preference to their relations), of popular nomination, and of nomination by 'one of the priests'; but he does not contemplate election by the body of presbyters, and he does imply that the bishop was, after designation, ordained by laying on of hands.[2] He is not talking, in this passage, specially of Alexandria, and he had long ceased to live there; but Caesarea was not very far off, so

populis praesunt' from the 'inferior sacerdos,' the 'laicus,' and the 'gentilis.' Again, speaking (*de Orat.* 28) of the different 'debts' which different classes of the community have to pay, he specifies the distinct debt of widow, deacon, presbyter, and continues: καὶ ἐπισκόπου δὲ ὀφειλὴ βαρυτάτη ἐστὶν ἀπαιτουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς ὅλης ἐκκλησίας σωτῆρος καὶ ἐκδικουμένη εἰ μὴ ἀποδιδῶτο. And in a similar strain *in Ierem.* xi. 3: οὐ πάντως ὁ κλῆρος σώζει . . . πλεῖον ἐγὼ ἀπαιτοῦμαι παρὰ τὸν διάκονον (this was after he was ordained priest), πλεῖον ὁ διάκονος παρὰ τὸν λαϊκόν· ὁ δὲ τὴν πάντων ἡμῶν ἐγκεχειρισμένος ἀρχὴν αὐτὴν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἀπαιτεῖται. Cf. *in Ezech.* v. 4; *in Luc.* xvii. ad fin.

(3) He puts the bishops alone in a remarkable way, as the Church's rulers: 'per singulas ecclesias bini sunt episcopi, alius visibilis, alius invisibilis; ille visui carnis, hic sensui patens' (*in Luc.* xiii.). He is alluding to the Angel of the Apocalypse, whom he conceives of as the spiritual guardian of the church and counterpart of the earthly bishop. This leads to the remark that—

(4) He conceives the bishop of his day to be the bishop of whose qualifications St. Paul instructs us (*in Matt.* xi. 15, xiv. 22; *c. Cels.* iii. 48). Also he speaks of bishops as the immemorial tradition in the Church; he speaks of people who can boast of fathers and ancestors προεδρίας ἠξιωμένοις ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπισκοπικοῦ θρόνου ἢ πρεσβυτερίου τιμῆς ἢ διακονίας εἰς τὸν λαόν (*in Matt.* xv. 26). And as he singles out 'stability' as a note of the Alexandrian church, when he is contrasting it with the pagan societies (*c. Cels.* iii. 30: πραεΐά τις καὶ εὐσταθής)—and this when Alexandria is specially mentioned among other churches—he is clearly not conscious of any change in the church's constitution which is going on. Nor does his language at all suggest that the episcopate of Alexandria was in a peculiar position.

[1] He does, as a fact, rebuke the bishops, especially those of great cities, for covetousness, secularity and pride, but not as if their order was at the moment exalting itself at the expense of the presbyters; cf. *in Matt.* xvi. 22, *in Exod.* xl. 6. (Bishops will hardly condescend to take counsel with the inferior priests.)

[2] *In Num.* xxii. 4. He quotes Num. xxvii. 18-20 (where Moses is directed to choose Joshua and lay hands upon him, etc.) and continues: 'audis evidenter ordinationem principis populi tam manifeste descriptam, ut paene expositione non egeat.' Just above he had brought the 'princeps populi' into comparison with the 'ecclesiarum principes,' and had distinguished him from the 'presbyteri' of Num. xi. 16.

that he could hardly have ignored any markedly different conditions in the great neighbouring church of Alexandria.

It does not seem as if anything like sufficient attention had been paid to this language of Origen's, which certainly renders very difficult the acceptance of any tradition differentiating the Alexandrian church of his experience from all other churches.[1] But the witness of Jerome—witness which is now reinforced by that of Severus of Antioch—has been so generally accepted by western writers from the fourth to the twelfth century and by modern critics, that it will be the better course, as our object is not merely archaeological, to face what is at any rate the possibility of its being true. It should then be noticed that Severus, in recording the tradition, shows that in his mind it carried with it no consequences such as modern controversy has sometimes attached to it, and that, when western church writers of the Middle Ages quote and accept Jerome's statement, it causes them no disquietude in view of the existing distinction of bishops and priests. They would maintain that no one can validly execute any ecclesiastical function which does not belong to him by the proper devolution of ecclesiastical authority. But this no one accuses the Alexandrian presbyters of having done. They were ordained, *ex hypothesi*, on the understanding that under certain circumstances they might be called,

But in any case there is no inconsistency with the principle of succession.

[1] So far again as Jerome's words postulate that the elective authority for the episcopate lay simply with the presbytery, it has against it the evidence that the ancient mode of episcopal election at Alexandria gave great power to the vote of the whole people. See Athan. *Apol. c. Ar.* 6 πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαός, and Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxi. 8, who praises this as the ancient and apostolic method.

Liberatus of Carthage (circa 560) tells us of a curious custom in the episcopal succession at Alexandria (*Breviarium* 20): 'Consuetudo quidem est Alexandriae illum qui defuncto succedit excubias super defuncti corpus agere, manumque dexteram eius capiti suo imponere, et sepulto manibus suis accipere collo suo beati Marci pallium et tunc legitime sedere.' But he cannot mean that this was a substitute for consecration by living bishops. We know that stress was laid in Athanasius' case (328 A.D.) both on popular election and public episcopal consecration: and the latter could not have been abandoned later.

by simple election, to execute the bishop's office. They were not only presbyters with the ordinary commission of the presbyter, but also bishops *in posse*.[1] Elsewhere there were two distinct ordinations, one making a man a presbyter and the other making him a bishop; at Alexandria there was only one ordination, which made a man a presbyter and potential bishop. When this arrangement ceased and Alexandria was assimilated to other churches, the presbyters began to be ordained as mere presbyters; and henceforward any assumption by one of them of episcopal powers would be treated as a mere assumption, the results of which were simply invalid. It is unnecessary to do more than recall, in view of such an hypothetical situation, the contention of the last chapter, namely, that the Church principle of succession would never be violated by the existence in any church of episcopal powers, whether free or conditional, in all the presbyters, supposing that those powers were not assumed by the individual for himself, but were understood to be conveyed to him by the ordination of the Church. The state of things, then, which is assumed to have existed at Alexandria would, if its existence were established, no doubt violate the complete uniformity of the church ministry in the period we are considering—it would require us to introduce qualifications into our generalization of results—but it would not affect the principle.[2]

Further evidence as to how the ministry was conceived from

So far we have been going through the evidence supplied by the history of Eastern Christianity on the *existence* of episcopal successions in every church. It remains to seek additional light on the

[1] Their position would not have been very unlike that of the chorepiscopi, who could only ordain validly (in the mind of the early Church) where they had the sanction of the town bishop.

[2] See Simcox *Early Church History* p. 359 n.[1].

conception entertained of the ministry; and that from three sources—

(1) writings which are concerned with worship and church order:

(2) the canons of councils:

(3) some representative Fathers.

(1) Liturgies, etc.

(1) Besides the oriental offices of ordination, of ancient though uncertain date,[1] and some mediaeval commentaries on the ancient rites, such as that of Symeon of Thessalonica, we have older sources of evidence. There is the work of the Syrian pseudo-Dionysius, *On the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, a work probably of the end of the fifth century, elaborating the mystical significance of the Church's orders. More ancient are the recently discovered Prayers of Bishop Serapion of Thmuis (c. 350), a friend of St. Athanasius, among which are prayers for ordinations or 'layings on of hands';[2] and the Syrian *Apostolic Constitutions*,[3] a work which in its present form may be some twenty-five years later than Serapion, but which is based almost throughout upon older material. In the portion which most concerns us its source is a *Church Order* of the third century, in all probability the work of Hippolytus; for the first six of the eight books its source is another third-century document known as the *Didascalia*. Between the *Church Order* and the *Didascalia* on the one side and the *Apostolic Constitutions* on the other lie the so-called *Canons of Hippolytus*, another recension of the *Church Order*: but there is no reason at all to think that this was

'Dionysius the Areopagite'

Serapion of Thmuis

Church Order of Hippolytus

[1] Given in Morinus *de S. Ord.* pars. ii. and see App. Note C, p. 320.

[2] See *Texte u. Untersuch. N.F.* ii. 3. b. (Leipzig, 1898); *Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book*, by John Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Salisbury (S.P.C.K., 1899); and Brightman in *Journal of Theol. Studies* i. pp. 88, 247 (1899, 1900).

[3] On their date and character see Lightfoot *Ignatius* i. p. 253, Brightman *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford, 1896) i. p. xvii, Funk *Die apostolischen Constitutionen* (Rottenburg, 1891): Lightfoot puts them somewhat earlier, Funk somewhat later, than the date given in the text. But Funk's principal merit lies in his critical edition, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (2 vols. Paderborn, 1906), which has for the first time made possible an adequate study of the document and its sources.

known to the author of the *Constitutions*, who was himself an Antiochene and drew on Syrian material in the *Didascalia* and Roman material in the *Church Order*, while the *Canons* are apparently Egyptian.[1] But the *Church Order*, though of Roman origin, belongs to the Roman Church before it had ceased to use the Greek language; and, as this *Order* lies at the basis of the Greek ritual of ordination in the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, it may most fitly be considered here. The portions which concern us run thus in the Latin[2] version :—

'Let a bishop be ordained after being chosen by all the people. And when the nomination has been made and has been acceptable to all, the people shall assemble, together with the presbytery and such bishops as shall be present, on the Lord's day. When all give consent, let them lay hands on him, and let the presbytery stand by quietly, but let all keep silence, praying in their heart for the descent of the Spirit. After which let one of the bishops present, at the request of all, laying his hand on him who is being ordained, pray aloud as follows: "O God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Father of mercies and God of all consolations, who dwellest in the height and beholdest the humble, who knowest all things before they come to pass, who hast set bounds in Thy Church by the word of Thy grace, who didst foreordain from the beginning a race of righteous men from Abraham, and didst establish princes and priests, and didst never leave Thy sanctuary without a ministry: Thou who from the foundation of the world hast been well-pleased to be glorified in those whom Thou hast chosen: pour out now the power that is of Thee, the princely Spirit which Thou gavest to Thy Beloved Son Jesus Christ, which He bestowed on Thy holy Apostles, who founded the Church in every

[1] No one of these three documents, neither *Church Order* nor *Didascalia* nor *Canons*, is extant in the original Greek. The *Canons* exist only in Arabic, itself translated from a Coptic version of the original Greek. They were brought into fresh notice by Achelis *Die Canones Hippolyti*, *Texte u. Untersuch.* vi. 4 (see also A. C. Headlam in the *Guardian* for 1896, pt. i. pp. 243, 699, 991): but the importance to be attributed to them is very much reduced, now that we have recovered in a Latin version enough of the *Church Order*, on which the *Canons* are based, to enable us to reconstruct it more or less entire with the help of oriental versions, especially the Ethiopic. The Latin was published from a Verona MS. by E. Hauler in 1900, *Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta Veronensia Latina* (Leipzig): an English version of the Ethiopic is given in Horner's *Statutes of the Apostles* (1904), p. 162.

[2] The original Greek of the prayer of ordination in the case of a bishop is preserved almost unaltered in the *Constitutiones per Hippolytum* (which consist for the most part of extracts from the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, but in this case go back to the *Church Order* itself) and with a good deal of expansion in *Ap. Const.* viii. 5 (Funk i. 474, ii. 78).

place, Thy sanctuary, for glory and unceasing praise to Thy name. Thou who knowest the heart of each one, grant to this Thy servant whom Thou hast chosen for the office of a bishop, that he may feed Thy holy flock, and may serve blamelessly as chief priest before Thee, ministering night and day, and may make propitiation before Thy Face, and may offer Thee the gifts of Thy holy Church, and in the spirit of the chief priesthood[1] may have authority to remit sins according to Thy command, to appoint clergy according to Thine ordinance,[2] to loose every bond according to the authority which Thou gavest to the apostles, and may please Thee in meekness and purity of heart, offering Thee an odour of sweet savour, through Thy Son Jesus Christ, through Whom to Thee be glory and might and honour, to the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit, both now and for ever and ever. Amen."

Then the new bishop receives the kiss of peace and proceeds at once to celebrate the Eucharist:[3] the prayer of consecration is given in full, and is the earliest complete form of it known to us. Benedictions for oil, and for cheese and olives, follow.

'When a presbyter is ordained, let the bishop lay his hand upon his head, the presbyters also touching him, and let him say according to the form already given, as we have already given it for the bishop, praying and saying: "O God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, look upon this Thy servant and impart to him the Spirit of grace and counsel, for 'help and government'[4] of Thy people in a pure heart, as Thou didst look upon the people of Thine election and commandedest Moses to choose presbyters whom Thou didst fill with the Spirit which Thou grantedst to Thy servant."'

While the presbyters thus 'join in the sealing' of the ordination of a presbyter,[5] in the ordination of a deacon the bishop alone takes part. The distinction lies in the fact that the deacon is simply a minister of the bishop, and has no share of that Spirit of counsel which is the common possession of the presbyterate.[6]

[1] *τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀρχιερατικῷ*; and just above *ἀρχιερατεύειν σοι*. It is worth noting that Hippolytus is the first Christian writer to use this group of words: compare the passage quoted at the end of App. Note G, p. 348.

[2] *διδόναι κλήρους*—literally, to allot clerical offices.

[3] The bishop's primary functions are liturgical, and it is in the performance of these that, at the date of this *Church Order*, his 'usurpatio iuris' consists: see Achelis p. 160.

[4] 1 Cor. xii. 28.

[5] 'Presbyter . . . super presbyteri ordinatione consignat, episcopo ordinante.'

[6] 'Non est enim particeps consilii in clero . . . non accipiens communem presbyteri (presbyterii?) Spiritum, eum cuius participes presbyteri sunt.'

In the middle of the prayer for the deacon's ordination the Latin, as we have it, breaks off: our other authorities contain, what no doubt the Latin also contained when complete, rules about the position of Confessors, Widows, Readers and Subdeacons, and also about the gift of healing. We are not concerned with any of these except the Confessors.

'If the Confessor has been in chains for the Name of Christ, they shall not lay hands upon him for the diaconate or presbyterate, since he has the honour of the presbyterate by his confession: but if he is made bishop, then hands shall be laid upon him. If, however, he was not brought before the governor, nor punished with chains or prison or sentence of condemnation, but was only insulted for the Name of the Lord and suffered minor punishment, then he is worthy of the presbyterate, but hands must be laid upon him.'[1]

That is to say: one who has been tortured for the faith—a martyr in will—is to rank as a presbyter without further ordination. Confession, without torture, does not exempt from ordination to the presbyterate, but qualifies for it.

Canons of Hippolytus.

But we must now turn back to the *Canons of Hippolytus*, because they present some remarkable variations from the *Church Order*, and it is just these variations to which much importance has been attached in recent times. The chief points of difference are these: (1) the ordination prayer for the bishop is said, not by one of the bishops, but by 'one of the bishops and presbyters': (2) the detailed description of the Eucharist as offered by the new bishop stops short at 'It is meet and right,' so that the prayer of consecration is only represented by the rubric 'Let him then say the prayer and finish the mass': (3) similarly the prayer at the ordination of a presbyter is omitted, and it is directed that the

[1] This rule as here given is reconstructed from the Ethiopic, Sahidic, and Arabic recensions of the *Church Order*, compared with can. vi. of the *Canons of Hippolytus*. But it must be noted that the Ethiopic allows Confession to take the place of Ordination only for the diaconate, not for the presbyterate.

prayer already given for the ordination of a bishop should serve for the ordination of a presbyter also, the words 'office of a bishop' being alone unsuitable: 'the bishop is in all respects the equivalent of the presbyter, except in regard to the throne and ordination, for the presbyter was not given authority to ordain': (4) the deacon is described not as the servant of the bishop, but as the servant of the bishop and presbyters.

Now of these four variations all, except the second,[1] are dominated by one motive, the enhancement of the dignity of presbyters. The fourth and last is certainly a sign of later date: it is not till the middle of the fourth century that we find deacons treated as ministering to presbyters as well as to bishops.[2] The third and most important is curiously parallel to the statements of Jerome and Ambrosiaster about bishops and presbyters, which will be discussed later on:[3] and it is likely that the *Canons of Hippolytus* are nearer in date to Jerome than to the *Church Order*, and that their deviations from the *Church Order*, so far as they are not purely accidental or arbitrary, represent the conditions and views of the fourth century rather than of the third.[4]

Yet even if this were not so, and if the *Canons* as they stand were rightly ascribed to the time of Hippolytus, it would still be true that the picture which they give is that of a Church life depending at

[1] The omission of the eucharistic prayer is probably due either to mere laziness on the part of the compiler, or to reluctance to reproduce a prayer of a type differing from what he and his readers heard every Sunday.

[2] Council of Nicaea can. xviii, οἱ διάκονοι . . . τοῦ μὲν ἐπισκόπου ὑπηρέται εἰσί, τῶν δὲ πρεσβυτέρων ἐλάττους τυγχάνουσι, shows that the earlier view still prevailed in 325. Half a century later the other view appears in Ambrosiaster and in the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

[3] P. 157 ff.

[4] On the ordination prayer for the presbyter see C. H. Turner *Journal of Theol. Studies* [1915] xvi. 542. Dr. Bartlet, *ib.* xvii. 248, still adheres to the view which would see in the *Canons of Hippolytus* the most faithful representation of the matter of Hippolytus' *Order*. But all previous treatment in English is now superseded by Dom R. H. Connolly's review of the whole problem, *The so-called Egyptian Church Order and derived documents* (*Texts and Studies* viii. 4: Cambridge, 1916).

every point upon the bishop. We notice that though the bishop may be but very little differentiated from the presbyter in other respects, yet the difference is none the less marked in the single matter of the power to ordain. The bishop only can ordain to the several orders, though probably a presbyter is to assist in the laying-on of hands in the case of a bishop, as Timothy was ordained by St. Paul but also 'with the laying-on of the hands of the presbytery.' Of course the bishop came, in course of time, to occupy a much more distinctive position; but in one sense we should notice that what succeeding ages witnessed was the evolution of the presbyter rather than of the bishop, for in the picture presented by these canons the presbyter is in fact a very subordinate official so long as the bishop is present who is the normal pastor.[1] He can hardly have been as essential to the community as the deacon. 'It is the bishop who normally, at any rate, celebrates the eucharist, it is the bishop who distributes the offerings and gifts to the poor; although the presbyters have a part in the baptismal service, it is the bishop to whom those to be baptized make their confession or profession,[2] who consecrates the oil with which the presbyter anoints them, who lays his hands on them with prayer for the reception of the Holy Spirit when they have been baptized. The bishop is clearly the centre and life and head of all authority in the community,'[3] its chief celebrant as well as ruler.

And this is the position in which we shall indisputably find the bishop when we look back to the letters of Ignatius at the very beginning of the

[1] In the bishop's absence, however, he takes his place (c. xxxiv.: Achelis p. 109) at the love-feast, and doubtless at the altar also.

[2] c. xix. (*ib.* p. 92) 'tunc confiteatur episcopo—huic enim soli de ipso est impositum onus.'

[3] Headlam in the *Guardian* for 1896, i. p. 991.

second century. Later we find a process of decentralization going on in the East, and much more in the West, which resulted in the presbyter gaining a more independent and influential ministry.[1]

But what it concerns us specially to notice in this inquiry is, that neither the evolution of the distinctive office of the presbyter nor the elevation of the bishop above his presbyters affected, so far as our evidence goes, that substantial point of distinction between the two offices, 'that the power of ordination is not granted to the presbyter.' This is to the author of the *Canons*, and this is still to Jerome and Chrysostom,[2] the one point of difference.

It was no doubt the fact that at the period of the document which underlies these *Canons*, the presbyterate was, under normal circumstances, rather a position of dignity than an administrative or liturgical office, and this accounts for the rule that the will for martyrdom—that is, confessorship with endurance of torture—is, without further ordination, to constitute a man a presbyter. What exactly this means, or exactly what powers would be included in it, we cannot determine. But it is, no doubt, because the presbyterate is rather the ecclesiastical dignity, and the episcopate the ecclesiastical office, that martyrdom qualifies without more ado for the one, while consecration is in any case required for the other. And we must add that the rule belongs to the period, the results of which appear in St. Cyprian's episcopate, when there was a tendency so to reverence the martyrs on whom God Himself had seemed to set His seal and consecration, as to allow them seriously to interfere with Church order and discipline. The evil effect of this mistaken reverence is apparent in the marked reversal of the language of this *Apostolic Constitutions:*

[1] e.g. at Alexandria by the beginning of the fourth century there were 'parish priests' in the later sense.

[2] See pp. 147, 159.

rule which appears in the later version of it in the *Apostolic Constitutions*.[1]

'A confessor is not ordained [i.e. is not in the clergy], for confessorship is a matter of will and endurance [not of ecclesiastial office]. But he is worthy of great honour as having confessed the name of God and His Christ before Gentiles and kings. But if there is need for him to become bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, then he is ordained. But if any confessor, not having been ordained, attempt to seize any such dignity for himself, on the ground of his confession, let him be deposed and expelled. For he is no confessor, since he has denied the ordinance of Christ, and is worse than an unbeliever.'

It is very interesting to watch the changes which take place in other respects also, as the rules of the *Church Order* pass into those for the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The one bishop who is to consecrate his fellow by laying-on of hands in the *Church Order* becomes the two or three bishops of the *Constitutions*, and the ceremony appears of the laying of the open book of the Gospels upon the head of him who is being ordained.[2] The prayer becomes more elaborate; in particular more specific allusion is made in it to the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice[3]—' the pure and bloodless sacrifice, the mystery of the New Covenant.' There is also in the *Constitutions* a characteristic addition to the prayer for the presbyter's ordination, specifying among his functions 'priestly ministries[4] on behalf of God's people.' But these changes are not considerable. And the prayers of Bishop Serapion for the laying-on of hands in the

[1] viii. 23. Ὁμολογήτης οὐ χειροτονεῖται· γνώμης γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ὑπομονῆς . . . ἐὰν δὲ χρεία αὐτοῦ ᾖ εἰς ἐπίσκοπον ἢ πρεσβύτερον ἢ διάκονον, χειροτονεῖται· εἰ δέ τις ὁμολογήτης μὴ χειροτονηθεὶς ἁρπάσῃ ἑαυτῷ ἀξίωμά τι τοιοῦτον ὡς διὰ τὴν ὁμολογίαν, οὗτος καθαιρείσθω καὶ ἀποβαλλέσθω· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν, ἐπείπερ ἤρνηται τὴν Χριστοῦ διάταξιν καὶ ἐστὶν ἀπίστου χείρων.

[2] viii. 4. 6, 27. 2. The laying-on of hands is not specifically mentioned in the account of the rite; but cf. viii. 46. 9, quoted below p. 345. The popular election still remains.

[3] Though the fact that in the *Church Order* the newly consecrated bishop immediately proceeds to celebrate the Eucharist shows that this was, in the days of Hippolytus, regarded as his most important function.

[4] ἱερουργίας (viii. 16. 5). Sacerdotal terminology is not absent from the *Church Order* or *Canons* of Hippolytus, but it is applied only to the bishop. The bishop is the 'high priest,' can. xxiv, see also can. xxxvi; and for the *Church Order* p. 133 n.[1] *supra*.

making of a presbyter, and of a bishop 'of the succession of the holy apostles,' suggest as simple an idea of these offices as the prayers in the *Church Order* of Hippolytus.[1]

More emphasis, however, is laid on sacerdotal principles in the *Constitutions* generally than in these ordinals.

their doctrine of the priesthood.

There is an intense insistence on the necessity for ordination to qualify a man for any ministerial work:[2] there is a reiterated magnifying of the office of bishops, whether as priests ministering the oblations of the new covenant, especially the eucharistic sacrifice,[3] or as prophets and kings ('he is your king and ruler,' nay more, 'he is your earthly God after God'[4]), or as mediators between God and His people (he is, 'after God, your father, begetting you

[1] See below for Serapion's prayers, pp. 320 f. Nothing has been said of the recognition of minor orders in these ordinals, for they do not fall within the purview of this work, and throughout they are placed upon a quite different level to those of the bishops, priests, and deacons, ordained by the Apostles: see *Apost. Const.* viii. 46. 9-12, Dionysius Areop., and Symeon of Thessalonica, περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν χειροτονιῶν c. i., *ap.* Morinus *de S.O.* pars ii. Hippolytus' *Church Order* prescribes emphatically that neither Widows nor Readers nor Virgins nor Subdeacons should have hands laid on them.

[2] E.g. ii. 27. 5: Πῶς οἷόν τε ἄνθρωπον ἑαυτὸν εἰς ἱερωσύνην ἐπιρρίπτειν, μὴ λαβόντα τὸ ἀξίωμα παρὰ κρείττονος, καὶ ποιεῖν ἐκεῖνα ἃ μόνοις τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἔξεστιν; Cf. ii. 28, iii. 10. 1: οὔτε λαικοῖς ἐπιτρέπομεν ποιεῖν τι τῶν ἱερατικῶν ἔργων. It seems admitted (viii. 46. 17) that God's supernatural or miraculous call, as in the case of Ananias (Acts ix. 18), dispenses with the necessity for human ordination. But cf. viii. 26: an exorcist with the gift of healing would require to be ordained to the regular ministry.

[3] E.g. ii. 25. 7: Ὑμεῖς οὖν σήμερον, ὦ ἐπίσκοποι, ἐστὲ τῷ λαῷ ὑμῶν ἱερεῖς, λευῖται, οἱ λειτουργοῦντες τῇ ἱερᾷ σκηνῇ, τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ παρεστῶτες τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ προσάγοντες αὐτῷ τὰς λογικὰς καὶ ἀναιμάκτους θυσίας διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως· ὑμεῖς τοῖς ἐν ὑμῖν λαϊκοῖς ἐστὲ προφῆται, ἄρχοντες καὶ ἡγούμενοι καὶ βασιλεῖς, οἱ μεσῖται θεοῦ καὶ τῶν πιστῶν αὐτοῦ, οἱ δοχεῖς τοῦ λόγου καὶ ἀγγελτῆρες, οἱ γνῶσται τῶν γραφῶν καὶ φθόγγοι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μάρτυρες τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, οἱ πάντων τὰς ἁμαρτίας βαστάζοντες καὶ περὶ πάντων ἀπολογούμενοι. Cf. ii. 27, 28.

[4] ii. 26. 4: Οὗτος ἄρχων καὶ ἡγούμενος ὑμῶν· οὗτος ὑμῶν βασιλεὺς καὶ δυνάστης· οὗτος ὑμῶν ἐπίγειος θεὸς μετὰ θεόν, ὃς ὀφείλει τῆς παρ' ὑμῶν τιμῆς ἀπολαύειν. περὶ γὰρ τούτου καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ἔλεγεν· Ἐγὼ εἶπα Θεοί ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ὑψίστου πάντες, καί· Θεοὺς οὐ κακολογήσεις. ὁ γὰρ ἐπίσκοπος προκαθεζέσθω ὑμῶν ὡς θεοῦ ἀξίᾳ τετιμημένος, ἢ κρατεῖ τοῦ κλήρου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ παντὸς ἄρχει. Cf. ii. 33. This is surely rather overstrained language: yet the groundwork of it is no invention of the *Constitutions*, since it belongs (like most of the passage quoted in the preceding note) to the third-century source of the first six books of *Ap. Const.*, the so-called *Didascalia*.

to adoption through water and the Holy Ghost'[1]): there is an emphatic distinction drawn between the powers of a bishop and those of a presbyter[2] ('the distinction of names is a distinction of realities'—specially, only a bishop can ordain): there is a strong and powerful assertion of the principle of order: finally, there is a noticeable passage on the apostolical succession, with special reference to the perpetuating of the eucharistic sacrifice.

'Christ, the only-begotten, was the first high priest by His Nature, not having snatched the honour for Himself, but being appointed by the Father; who became man for us, and, when offering His spiritual sacrifice to His God and Father before His passion, commanded us[3] only to do this, though there were with us others too who had believed on Him—but a believer did not, as such, become a priest or obtain the high-priestly honour—and after His assumption we, having offered according to His commandment a pure and bloodless sacrifice, appointed bishops and presbyters, and deacons seven in number.'[4]

The later writings to which we have alluded are without the exaggerated tone which sometimes appears in the *Constitutions*, and the thoughts connected with the various ordinations are often of

[1] ii. 26. 4: the bishop is *μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς πρὸς αὐτὸν λατρείαις . . . οὗτος μετὰ θεὸν πατὴρ ὑμῶν, δι' ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος ἀναγεννήσας ὑμᾶς εἰς υἱοθεσίαν.* ii. 32. 3: *δι' οὗ* [sc. *ἐπισκόπου*] *τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ὁ κύριος ἐν ὑμῖν ἔδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειροθεσίᾳ, δι' οὗ ἅγια δόγματα μεμαθήκατε καὶ θεὸν ἐγνώκατε καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν πεπιστεύκατε, δι' οὗ ἐγνώσθητε ὑπὸ θεοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐσφραγίσθητε ἐλαίῳ ἀγαλλιάσεως καὶ μύρῳ συνέσεως, δι' οὗ υἱοὶ φωτὸς ἀνεδείχθητε, δι' οὗ κύριος ἐν τῷ φωτισμῷ ὑμῶν, τῇ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου χειροθεσίᾳ μαρτυρῶν, ἑφ' ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὴν ἱερὰν ἐξέτεινε φωνὴν λέγων· Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.*

[2] viii. 46. 9: *Ἴστε γὰρ πάντως ἐπισκόπους παρ' ἡμῶν ὀνομασθέντας καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους εὐχῇ καὶ χειρῶν ἐπιθέσει, τῇ διαφορᾷ τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν πραγμάτων δεικνύοντας· οὐ γὰρ ὁ βουλόμενος παρ' ἡμῖν ἐπλήρου τὴν χεῖρα, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς κιβδήλου τῶν δαμάλεων ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἱεροβοὰμ παρακεκομμένης ἱερωσύνης, ἀλλ' ὁ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ.* iii. 11: *Οὐκ ἐπιτρέπομεν πρεσβυτέροις χειροτονεῖν.* viii. 46. 1: *Ἐκεῖνο κοινῇ πάντες παραγγέλλομεν, ἕκαστον ἐμμένειν τάξει τῇ δοθείσῃ αὐτῷ καὶ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν τοὺς ὅρους.*

[3] The Apostles are supposed to be the speakers.

[4] viii. 46. 14: *Πρῶτος τοίνυν τῇ φύσει ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ μονογενὴς Χριστός, οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τὴν τιμὴν ἁρπάσας, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς καταστα θείς· ὃς γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν προσφέρων τῷ θεῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ πατρὶ πρὸ τοῦ πάθους, ἡμῖν διετάξατο μόνοις τοῦτο ποιεῖν, καίτοι ὄντων σὺν ἡμῖν καὶ ἑτέρων τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν πεπιστευκότων· ἀλλ' οὐ πάντως ὁ πιστεύσας ἤδη καὶ ἱερεὺς κατέστη ἢ ἀρχιερατικῆς ἀξίας ἔτυχε· μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάληψιν αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς, προσενέγκοντες κατὰ τὴν διάταξιν αὐτοῦ θυσίαν καθαρὰν καὶ ἀναίμακτον, προεχειρισάμεθα ἐπισκόπους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους ἑπτὰ τὸν ἀριθμόν.*

great moral beauty and interest. It is tempting to dwell upon them.[1] But, in spite of certain differences, the whole literature is pervaded by the same principles, and it has been better for our purpose to exhibit them as they appear in the earliest documents.

(2) Canons of Greek councils.

(2) What is the witness of oriental councils? It is very slight. For, as the principle of the ministry was little opposed, it was as little contended for; and it is not till the fourth century that we begin to have the canons of councils. The canonical literature is occupied a good deal with clerical discipline, and the distinctive powers of bishops, priests, and deacons are throughout assumed and guarded. The earliest canons in Greek are those of Ancyra. The council held here was of the nature of a 'general council' of the churches of Asia Minor and Syria, 'to heal the wounds inflicted on the Church by the persecution under Maximin.'[2] The language of its twenty-five canons implies throughout the threefold ministry: there is the general government of the bishop,[3] the priestly ministration of the presbyters,[4] and the assistant ministry of the deacons.[5] The thirteenth canon has been much quoted as (implicitly) giving not only country bishops but also *town presbyters* a power to ordain, with the leave of the bishop of each diocese; 'that it be not allowed to country bishops to ordain presbyters or deacons, nor even to city presbyters, except permission be given in each parish by the bishop in writing.' But the reading 'to city presbyters' is more than doubtful, and apart from this reading the whole interpretation in this sense

Ancyra, A.D. 314.

[1] Some of the chief passages are quoted in App. Note C, p. 320 ff.

[2] Hefele *Conciliengeschichte* § 16.

[3] Cann. 2, 5, 10, 15. The clergy in general (can. 3) constitute a τάξις.

[4] Can. 1: presbyters τῆς τιμῆς τῆς κατὰ τὴν καθέδραν μετέχουσιν; their functions are προσφέρειν, ὁμιλεῖν, λειτουργεῖν τὰς ἱερατικὰς λειτουργίας.

[5] Can. 2: ἡ ἱερὰ λειτουργία, ἡ τοῦ ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφέρειν—i.e. either the *presenting* the oblation to the presbyter who 'offers' (προσφέρει, c. 1; cf. the use of ἀναφέρειν in the account of the ordination of a bishop, *Apost. Const.* viii. 5. 9), or the communicating the people (see next page, Can. Nicaen. 18).

Nicaea, A.D. 325.

falls to the ground.[1] The great Council of Nicaea, among other canons,[2] prohibits deacons 'who have no power to offer' from 'giving the body of Christ to the presbyters' who have the sacrificial authority;[3] it also sternly rebukes a practice, which had come to the ears of the Fathers, of deacons communicating even before bishops. 'Let all these things, then,' the canon concludes, 'be done away, and let the deacons remain within their proper limits, knowing that they are the servants of the bishop and inferior to the presbyters: and let them take the Eucharist according to their rank after the presbyters, when it is given them either by the bishop or the presbyter. And deacons must not even sit down in the midst of the presbyters, for this is contrary to rule [canon] and order. And if any one will not obey, even after these regulations, let him be deposed from his diaconate.'

At Nicaea, and in the synods which followed, we have a great multitude of canons bearing on clerical discipline—insisting on clergy passing gradually

[1] The evidence is too complicated to be dealt with at this point, but it will be found in App. Note D, p. 327. There were 'country priests' as well as 'country bishops.' Each class, having in some sense the same powers as the corresponding class of the town, had limited rights in the exercise of them. Thus only on an emergency could country priests celebrate in the town church (Can. Neocaes. 13); on the other hand country bishops could 'offer' in the town freely (Can. Neocaes. 14) but not ordain at all without special permission: cf. p. 330.

The council of Neocaesarea was almost contemporary with that of Ancyra: among its canons is one which mentions a current idea that the imposition of hands in ordination carried with it the absolution from all sins except carnal ones (can. 9).

[2] The legislation about the metropolitan sees, i.e. the distinction of rank amongst bishops, does not here concern us. Notice will hereafter be taken of the absence of clear distinction between a *valid* and a *canonical* ordination (p. 174).

[3] Can. 18 (προσφέρειν, διδόναι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ); cf. Can. Laodic. 19. The practice here rebuked, of deacons communicating presbyters, may have some analogy with the western custom, which gave the deacons an independent authority to minister the consecrated elements. 'As the consecration belongs to the priest, so the dispensation of the sacrament belongs to the minister (deacon) . . . the former sanctifies the oblations, the latter dispenses them when they are sanctified. Moreover, the priests themselves are not allowed for fear of presumption to take the chalice from the Lord's table, unless it have been given them by the deacon.' Thus 'without deacons a priest has his name but not his office.' This comes from Isidore of Seville *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 8 (ap. Hittorp. p. 23 [ed. 1591, p. 20]); it is repeated by Rabanus Maurus *de Inst. Cler.* i. 7 (ap. Hittorp. p. 316 [p. 268]), and by Ivo, bishop of Chartres (ap. Hittorp. p. 472 [p. 413]). At the same time the deacon's 'ministerium' is carefully distinguished from the priesthood. Cf. Can. Ancyr. 2.

through the various grades of the hierarchy, prohibiting their passing from one diocese to another, limiting their respective rights, regulating the gradations of rank—but nothing more that concerns our present purpose.

(3) Greek Fathers. 2nd century

(3) What is the witness of the Greek Fathers? The powerful testimony of Ignatius, at the beginning of the second century, to the divine and exclusive authority of the bishop, as in each community the sole source of government and ministry, falls outside the period now under consideration and will be taken account of later. At the end of the century Clement of Alexandria, as we have seen (p. 116 f.), says but little of the ministry, but speaks of its three orders as representing ascending grades of spiritual dignity.

3rd century

In the third century we have found in the Clementines a theory of the functions of the threefold ministry, in which the bishop has the supreme administration and the authority to bind and loose, but in which his *teaching* authority, as the successor to the 'chair of the apostle,' or 'the chair of Christ,' the great Prophet, is mainly emphasized.[1] But almost all that we get on the theory of the ministry in the church writers of the East [2] consists of scattered

[1] See p. 111 n.[2]. It must be remembered that the Clementines are more or less Ebionite.

[2] It should, however, be said that Firmilian of Caesarea, one of the most distinguished bishops of the third century, in his letter in reply to Cyprian, A.D. 256 (ap. Cypr. *Ep.* lxxv.), reproduces all Cyprian's language about the episcopate. See § 16: 'Potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum apostolis data est et ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt et episcopis qui eis ordinatione vicaria successerunt.' § 17: 'Stephanus se successionem Petri tenere contendit.' It may be noticed that he speaks of bishops as *presbyters*: 'quando omnis potestas et gratia in ecclesia constituta sit, ubi praesident maiores natu [i.e. οἱ πρεσβύτεροι] qui et baptizandi et manum imponendi et ordinandi possident potestatem' (§ 7): yet he also (§ 8) specifies bishops as claiming to give the Holy Ghost by laying on of hands: 'ut hi quidem [i.e. episcopi qui nunc] possint per solam manus impositionem venientibus haereticis dare Spiritum sanctum.' Cf. § 4: 'seniores et praepositi.' The word 'presbyteri' could still be used in such a sense as to cover the bishops: in this sense the nearest English rendering is probably 'fathers.' This letter must have been translated by Cyprian. The traces of a Greek original, however, are plain; see *Dict. Chr. Biog.* s.v. CYPRIAN i. p. 751 n.[x]. We can hardly be wrong so far in concluding that Firmilian accepted and repeated Cyprian's language about the episcopate, though he uses οἱ πρεσβύτεροι in a sense which leads to Cyprian translating it into maiores natu.

references in the writings of Origen. To him the ministry not only represents the divine authority of
4th century. government, but is a priesthood, after the analogy of the Mosaic, and in application of the one priesthood of Christ.[1]

Athanasius; In the fourth century the body of testimony grows with the mass of writings. There is, to quote some examples, the beautiful letter of Athanasius to Dracontius. Dracontius was a monk, who had been elected to a bishopric close to Alexandria, and had received the 'grace of the episcopate,' but afterwards, moved by various fears, fled into concealment and left his high charge. Athanasius endeavours to recall him to his duty, in part by reminding him of monks who have made good bishops, but principally by recalling to his mind the dignity of the episcopate—as instituted by Christ through His Apostles and having, therefore, not merely the authority of the Church but the authority of Christ Himself, and as being the essential condition of the continuous life of the Church and the handing down of grace; by reminding him also that he has received an actual grace in his ordination as real as the grace of baptism, for which he will be in any case responsible.[2]

[1] See *in Levit.* v. 3: Christ is the only sacrifice and the only priest; but He has given His priesthood to His Church; 'consequens est ut secundum imaginem eius qui sacerdotium ecclesiae dedit, etiam ministri et sacerdotes ecclesiae peccata populi accipiant, et ipsi imitantes magistrum remissionem peccatorum populo tribuant.' The priests of the Lord who preside over the churches are said repropitiare delicta (§ 4), but this is explained of the moral process by which they bring men back to God. There are strong exhortations to confession, which is to be private or public at the confessor's discretion, *in Psalm.* xxxvii. [xxxviii.] 18, hom. ii. 6; *in Levit.* ii. 4.

It should be mentioned at the same time that Origen seems to say that the unworthiness of the minister *does* affect the spiritual validity of his ministrations; cf. *in Levit.* v. 12: the unworthy priest 'non est sacerdos' 'non potest sacerdos nominari.' See Bigg *B. L.* p. 215 [ed. 2 p. 260] f.

We have quoted from Origen above (p. 127 n.[2]) on the threefold ministry.

[2] *Ep. ad Dracont.* 3, 4: Εἰ δὲ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἡ διάταξις οὐκ ἀρέσκει σοι, οὐδὲ νομίζεις τὸ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτούργημα μισθὸν ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ καταφρονεῖν τοῦ ταῦτα διαταξαμένου σωτῆρος πεποίηκας σαυτόν· παρακαλῶ, μὴ τοιαῦτα λογίζου μηδὲ ἀνέχου τῶν ταῦτα συμβουλευόντων· οὐ γὰρ ἄξια Δρακοντίου ταῦτα· ἃ γάρ ὁ κύριος διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων τετύπωκε, ταῦτα καλὰ καὶ βέβαια μένει, ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀδελφῶν δειλία παύσεται. εἰ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν νοῦν εἶχον πάντες, οἷον νῦν ἔχουσιν οἱ συμβουλεύοντές σοι,

There is a temptation to dwell on the spiritual beauty and power which is put into the patristic conception of the ministry. When is Gregory of Nazianzus' eloquence so high as in speaking of the priesthood? There is the intense sense of the dignity of the priesthood, of the surpassing moral claim which it makes on those who share it;[1] there is the clear and powerful realization of its connexion with the whole purpose of the Incarnation, of the dependence of the priesthood of the Christian ministry upon the unique priesthood of Christ, and of its relation to the Mosaic priesthood as being its spiritual counterpart and fulfilment;[2] there is the

Gregory of Nazianzus;

πῶς ἂν ἐγένου σὺ χριστιανός, ἐπισκόπων μὴ ὄντων; ἐὰν δὲ καὶ οἱ μεθ' ἡμᾶς ἀναλάβωσι τὸν τοιοῦτον νοῦν, πῶς ἂν συστῆναι δυνήσωνται αἱ ἐκκλησίαι; ἢ νομίζουσιν οἱ συμβουλεύοντές σοι μηδὲν εἰληφέναι σε, ὅτι καταφρονοῦσιν; ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο ψευδῶς. ὥρα γὰρ αὐτοὺς νομίζειν μηδὲν εἶναι μηδὲ τὴν τοῦ λουτροῦ χάριν, ἐάν τινες τούτου καταφρονῶσι· ἀλλ' εἴληφας, ὦ ἀγαπητὲ Δρακόντιε· μὴ ἀνέχου τῶν συμβουλευόντων σοι, μηδὲ ἀπάτα σαυτόν· ἀπαιτηθήσεται γὰρ τοῦτο παρὰ τοῦ δεδωκότος θεοῦ. ἢ οὐκ ἤκουσας τοῦ ἀποστόλου λέγοντος Μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος; The expression ἡ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς χάρις occurs in § 2.

[1] See especially *Orat.* ii. 94, 95 (on the occasion of his ordination as presbyter, A.D. 361): Οἶδα δ' ἔγωγε μηδὲ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς σώμασι μώμους τῶν ἱερέων ἢ τῶν θυμάτων ἀνεξετάστους μένοντας ἀλλὰ τελείους τέλεια προσάγειν νενομισμένον, σύμβολον, οἶμαι, τοῦτο τῆς κατὰ ψυχὴν ἀρτιότητος· μηδὲ στολῆς τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἢ σκεύους τινὸς τῶν ἁγίων ψαύειν παντὶ θεμιτὸν ὄν· μηδὲ τὰς θυσίας αὐτὰς ὑφ' ὧν καὶ ὅτε καὶ οὗ μὴ καθῆκον ἦν ἀναλίσκεσθαι· μηδὲ τὸ ἔλαιον ἀπομιμεῖσθαι τῆς χρίσεως μηδὲ τὸ θυμίαμα τῆς συνθέσεως· μηδὲ εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν εἰσιέναι ὅστις ἢ ψυχὴν ἢ σῶμα οὐ καθαρός, μέχρι καὶ τῶν μικροτάτων· τοσούτου δεῖ εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων προσφοιτᾷν θαρροῦντα, ὧν ἑνὶ καὶ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ μόνον ἐπιβατὸν ἦν· τοσούτου δεῖ τὸ καταπέτασμα ἢ τὸ ἱλαστήριον ἢ τὴν κιβωτὸν ἢ τὰ Χερουβὶμ ἢ προσβλέπειν εἶναι παντὸς ἢ προσάπτεσθαι. ταῦτα οὖν εἰδὼς ἐγώ, καὶ ὅτι μηδεὶς ἄξιος τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ θεοῦ, καὶ θύματος καὶ ἀρχιερέως, ὕστις μὴ πρότερον ἑαυτὸν παρέστησε τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν, μηδὲ τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν εὐάρεστον ἐπεδείξατο, μηδὲ ἔθυσε τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως καὶ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον, ἣν μόνην ὁ πάντα δοὺς ἀπαιτεῖ παρ' ἡμῶν θυσίαν, πῶς ἔμελλον θαρρῆσαι προσφέρειν αὐτῷ τὴν ἔξωθεν, τὴν τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντίτυπον, ἢ πῶς ἱερέως σχῆμα καὶ ὄνομα ὑποδύεσθαι, πρὶν ὁσίοις ἔργοις τελειῶσαι τὰς χεῖρας;

[2] *Orat.* x. 4: Διὰ τοῦτο εἰς μέσον ἄγεις καὶ ὑποχωροῦντος λαμβάνῃ καὶ παρὰ σεαυτὸν καθίζεις τοῦτο τὸ ἐμὸν ἀδίκημα, φαίης ἄν, καὶ κοινωνὸν ποιῇ τῶν φροντίδων καὶ τῶν στεφάνων· διὰ τοῦτο χρίεις ἀρχιερέα καὶ περιβάλλεις τὸν ποδήρη καὶ περιτίθης τὴν κίδαριν καὶ προσάγεις τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ τῆς πνευματικῆς ὁλοκαυτώσεως καὶ θύεις τὸν μόσχον τῆς τελειώσεως καὶ τελειοῖς τὰς χεῖρας τῷ πνεύματι καὶ εἰσάγεις εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων ἐποπτεύσοντα καὶ πομπεύσοντα καὶ λειτουργὸν τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος· εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄξιον ὑμῶν τε τῶν χριόντων καὶ ὑπὲρ οὗ καὶ εἰς ὃν ἡ χρίσις, οἶδε τοῦτο ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ καὶ ὄντως χριστοῦ, ὃν ἔχρισεν ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους αὐτοῦ, χρίσας τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα τῇ θεότητι, ὥστε ποιῆσαι τὰ ἀμφότερα ἕν, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν. καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ ἔθετο ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἐστήκαμεν καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

unfailing spirituality of idea—the outward sacrifice, which it is the priest's high vocation to offer, always being kept in close connexion with its inward and spiritual correlative, 'the sacrifice of praise and of a contrite heart, which is the only sacrifice which God asks of us';[1] there is the anxious sense of the difficulty of the pastoral cure, in view of all the perplexing varieties in men's dispositions and necessities, capacities and states of life, all of which the pastor must have in constant and instinctive view; there is, lastly, the strong belief in the reality of ordination grace conveyed through the laying on of hands.[2]

Chrysostom; John Chrysostom, again, is emphatic in asserting that orthodoxy is 'of no avail to justify a Christian body, unless its priesthood is secured by proper ordination.'[3] But if he thus shows himself to be alive to the spiritual dignity of the priesthood, in virtue alike of its sacrificial and of its judicial powers, he is equally alive to its responsibility for individual souls—laying immense stress on the necessity for considerateness, for gentle and patient self-adaptation to the different characters and needs and weaknesses of men, whether of high or low estate.[4] He is as

[1] See the quotation above from *Orat.* ii. On the true succession to the episcopate—moral as well as actual—see *Orat.* xxi. 8 on St. Athanasius.

[2] Cf. the account of St. Basil on his death-bed (*Orat.* xliii. 78): θαυματουργεῖ τι τῶν προειρημένων οὐκ ἔλαττον—waking his faculties of speech and action on the verge of death to ordain some of his disciples, τὴν χεῖρα δίδωσι καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα. St. Basil's own clear view about Church ordinations is cited pp. 174 n.[3], 347. There is a striking passage on the sacramental change wrought in a man by ordination in Gregory of Nyssa, *in Bapt. Chr.*, *P. G.* xlvi. col. 581 D.

[3] *In Ephes. Hom.* xi. [ed. Bened. xi. 87 A], and see his famous work *de Sacerdotio* iii. 4-7, vi. 4.

[4] Cf. *de Sacerdot.* ii. 3, 4; iii. 16 (on the case of the widows); iv. (latter part); vi. 8. This is a remarkable feature of the patristic conception of the ministry; for great orators, like Gregory and Chrysostom, are apt to be more alive to the common sensibilities of man than sympathetic with the differences of individual temperament. This insistence on the need of discerning men's different needs and characters appears equally in the western writers on the ministry. If it is not so prominent in St. Ambrose's *de Officiis*, it appears sometimes remarkably in St. Leo's conception of government where we should not expect it, and it is very prominent in St. Gregory (*de Cura Pastorali* ii. init. and iii.: this work had immense recognition and authority in the West and even in the East; see preface to Mr. Bramley's translation). The same characteristic appears in the instructions to the penitentiary priest in the ancient *Ordo Romanus* (ap. Hittorp. p. 25 f. [ed. 1591, p. 18]).

impressive on the function of the pastor as on that of the priest. We should notice also that, while he speaks of the common priesthood which belongs to bishops and presbyters and lays stress (like some Westerns) on the closeness of the two orders to one another in dignity, he never fails to distinguish the unique privilege and power of ordaining which belongs to the bishop.[1]

Epiphanius.

This special power of the episcopate was emphasized in the famous saying of Chrysostom's elder contemporary, Epiphanius, that while presbyters could beget children to the Church, i.e. by baptism, only bishops could beget fathers to the Church, i.e. by ordination. This passage in Epiphanius[2] is important, because it gives us an expression of the Church's mind in clear view of an antagonistic position. A certain Aerius[3] had definitely held that there was no difference of order[4] between bishop and

[1] Cf. *Hom. in* 1 *Tim.* xi. 1: Οὐ πολὺ τὸ μέσον [πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἐπισκόπων]· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ διδασκαλίαν εἰσὶν ἀναδεδεγμένοι καὶ προστασίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. καὶ ἃ περὶ ἐπισκόπων εἶπε, ταῦτα καὶ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἁρμόττει· τῇ γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μόνον ὑπερβεβήκασι, καὶ τούτῳ μόνον δοκοῦσι πλεονεκτεῖν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους. *Hom. in Phil.* i. [ii] 1: οὐκ ἂν δὲ πρεσβύτεροι ἐπίσκοπον ἐχειροτόνησαν. *Hom. in* 1 *Tim.* xiii. 1: οὐ γὰρ δὴ πρεσβύτεροι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἐχειροτόνουν. He admits (on Phil. i. 1) that St. Paul uses the terms bishop and presbyter interchangeably; but so also, he adds, is the word διακονία applied to the bishop's office. The language was not fixed, but the three offices were distinct: ὅπερ οὖν ἔφην, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκαλοῦντο ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι Χριστοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι πρεσβύτεροι, ὅθεν καὶ νῦν πολλοὶ συμπρεσβυτέρῳ ἐπίσκοποι γράφουσι καὶ συνδιακόνῳ [compare and contrast Dionysius of Alexandria's use of συμπρεσβύτερός τε . . . καὶ διάκονοι, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 11. 3]· λοιπὸν δὲ τὸ ἰδιάζον ἑκάστῳ ἀπονενέμηται ὄνομα, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος.

[2] *adv. Haer.* lxxv. 4: Ὅτι μὲν ἀφροσύνης ἐστὶ τὸ πᾶν ἐμπλέων [sc. Aerius], τοῖς σύνεσιν κεκτημένοις τοῦτο δῆλον, τὸ [read τῷ] λέγειν αὐτὸν ἐπίσκοπον καὶ πρεσβύτερον ἴσον εἶναι. καὶ πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο δυνατόν; ἡ μὲν γάρ ἐστι πατέρων γεννητικὴ τάξις· πατέρας γὰρ γεννᾷ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἡ δὲ πατέρας μὴ δυναμένη γεννᾷν διὰ τῆς τοῦ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας τέκνα γεννᾷ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, οὐ μὴν πατέρας ἡ διδασκάλους. καὶ πῶς οἷόν τε ἦν τὸν πρεσβύτερον καθιστᾷν μὴ ἔχοντα χειροθεσίαν τοῦ χειροτονεῖν, ἢ εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἴσον τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ;

[3] Aerius was in opposition not only to the authority of bishops, but to other customs of the Church. He was also definitely Arian in his theology; but Epiphanius does not profess to connect his Arianism with his views on Church order, and indeed brings the same charge of heterodoxy against Eustathius of Sebaste, the bishop with whom Aerius quarrelled. The account rather suggests (Epiphanius is the sole source of our knowledge about Aerius) that the teaching of Aerius embodied one of those ascetic reactions against Church order and the hierarchy which the canons of Gangra and the *Apostolic Constitutions* set themselves to repudiate. Aerius was still alive (§ 1) when Epiphanius wrote, about A.D. 375.

[4] μία τάξις, καὶ μία τιμή, καὶ ἓν ἀξίωμα (§ 3).

presbyter. 'The bishop lays on hands,' he said, 'but so does the presbyter:[1] the bishop baptizes, so does the presbyter likewise: the bishop is the minister of worship, so is the presbyter: the bishop sits upon the raised seat (throne), and the presbyter too.' There is then no difference. Aerius does not seem to have appealed to any Church tradition, but simply to facts in the Church's present constitution and to the common use of the words 'presbyter' and 'episcopus' in the New Testament. Epiphanius meets his argument from the New Testament with a mixture of truth and error with which we are not at present concerned.[2] He meets him, however, first of all with an appeal to the mind of the Church on the matter. His customary abusiveness of tone must not blind us to the fact that he speaks clearly, with the consciousness that he is on quite sure ground, when he says that, whatever the presbyter may do, he cannot lay on hands in ordination—that in this sense bishops alone constitute the 'generative order' of the Church.

Summary for the East.

Now the evidence of the Eastern Church has been passed in review.[3] What is the result? Taking account at present only of the period after 150 A.D., we have found the threefold ministry everywhere in

[1] χειροθετεῖ, φησι, ἐπίσκοπος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος. I.e. in certain benedictions of penitents the priest used prayer with the laying on of hands—'the prayer of imposition of hands.' This at least the Church would have admitted; ἐπίσκοπος χειροθετεῖ, χειροτονεῖ . . . πρεσβύτερος χειροθετεῖ, οὐ χειροτονεῖ (*Apost. Const.* viii. 28). See note (22) on *Apost. Const.* viii. ch. 9, in Migne *Patrol. Graec.* i. col. 1083.

[2] He denies (unlike Chrysostom) that St. Paul uses πρεσβύτερος and ἐπίσκοπος of the same person. So far he has a bad case. On the other hand he argues that the Church in the apostolic days was incomplete; in some places there were bishops and deacons, in others presbyters, according to the degree of completeness of each church or the fitness of individuals: οὐ γὰρ πάντα εὐθὺς ἠδυνήθησαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι καταστῆσαι . . οὕπω [οὕτω MSS.] τῆς ἐκκλησίας λαβούσης τὰ πληρώματα τῆς οἰκονομίας. οὕτω κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ ἦσαν οἱ τόποι. καὶ γὰρ ἕκαστον πρᾶγμα οὐκ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὰ πάντα ἔσχεν· ἀλλὰ προβαίνοντος τοῦ χρόνου τὰ πρὸς τελείωσιν τῶν χρειῶν κατηρτίζετο (§ 4). He also calls attention (§ 5) to the fact that the presbyters have at least some one over them in the Pastoral Epistles. Cf. Theodore Mops. on 1 Tim. iii. 8 (ed. Swete ii. 117).

[3] There is a passage about the apostolic succession, which may be referred to, in Ephraem Syrus *adv. Haer.* serm. xxii, see *Opp. Syr.* [ed. Rom. 1740] ii. p. 488.

existence, wherever evidence exists, and regarded as the only authoritative form of ministry. The authority to ordain the clergy has also been found to belong to the bishops, wherever the question can be raised, nor can fair evidence be produced of any single instance in which ordination by a presbyter was either allowed or contemplated as under any circumstances allowable or valid.[1] As to the exceptional arrangement supposed to have existed at Alexandria, we have both shown grave reason to doubt the evidence, and also, for the sake of those who still accept the evidence, given what we think would be the true explanation, if the facts were as Jerome states them to have been.

B. The West. Episcopal successions not doubted.

B. We pass from the witness of Greek to that of Latin Christianity. Here we may deal very briefly with the evidence for the existence of the successions of bishops in the period under consideration, for it is not disputed. The episcopal succession was clearly of immemorial antiquity at Rome when Irenaeus wrote. There is no trace of a pre-episcopal age in any other part of Italy, or in Africa, Gaul, or Spain. The beautiful letter of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, giving an account of the persecution which fell upon them in the time of Marcus Aurelius, confirms the testimony of Irenaeus for Gaul.[2] The language of Tertullian is evidence enough for Africa, where indeed episcopacy developed into an exuberance of sees rivalled only in Asia.

In later centuries, it is true, episcopacy took some remarkable forms, especially, as we saw (p. 96), in the Irish Church.[3] There Christianity was monastic in a

[1] See on the alleged case of the abbot Paphnutius, App. Note E, p. 332.

[2] There is the aged bishop—Pothinus, ὁ τὴν διακονίαν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐν Λουγδούνῳ πεπιστευμένος; there is the deacon—Sanctus; there is the presbyter—Irenaeus; see Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1. §§ 17, 29, v. 4.

[3] A satisfactory account of the episcopate in the Scotic Church of Ireland may be found in Todd's *St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland*, and Reeves' *Eccl. Antiquities of Down, Connor, and Dromore*. Its three notable features were (1) its indefinite

unique sense. The abbot took his place as spiritual head side by side with the chieftain of the clan. Often, indeed, the same person was both abbot and chieftain, and the old clan government continued with a new monastic character. Under these circumstances the bishop lost the governing authority which properly belonged to his office and became a mere instrument kept to perform those spiritual functions which he only could fulfil. But for such purposes he was kept: 'the bishops were always applied to, to consecrate churches, to ordain to the ecclesiastical degrees or Holy Orders, including the consecration of other bishops; to give Confirmation, and the more solemn benedictions; and to administer the Holy Communion with peculiar rites.'[1] No accession of power to abbot or king ever militated against the

multiplication; (2) its undiocesan character; (3) its subordination to the abbot-chiefs. The Church outside the empire, as inside it, was organized on the lines of the existing society. Thus in Ireland it became *tribal*, and small chieftaincies would have resulted in small episcopates (Reeves p. 303: 'the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop was coextensive with the temporal sway of the chieftain'). But what introduced its unique features into Church organization here was its predominantly monastic character. The abbot was the real church ruler, and he was not always or generally a bishop. Hence the subordination of the episcopate. The bishops even lost control over the ordinations which they administered (cf. Bede *H. E.* iii. 4; Todd pp. 7-25). The episcopate, having thus lost its characteristic functions of government, was given as a mark of spiritual distinction (Todd p. 5). Thus it became indefinitely multiplied; seven bishops are often found together in one spot (Todd pp. 33-35). Also it lost its diocesan character (Reeves p. 135 f. on 'the ambulatory nature of episcopacy'). When the Danish invasions (c. A.D. 795 and onward) drove the Irish clergy and monks in great numbers on to the continent of Europe, the bishops seem to have behaved themselves as if they were in their own country, in entire neglect of diocesan restrictions. Hence conciliar enactments against these 'Scoti qui se dicunt episcopos esse' (Reeves p. 135). And up to the twelfth century, when the Irish Church was organized on diocesan lines under papal influence, the looseness of Irish episcopacy was a standing scandal to 'canonical' Europe; see the protests of Anselm and Bernard, quoted by Todd pp. 2-4: 'dicitur,' writes Anselm to a titular king of Ireland, 'episcopos in terra vestra passim eligi et sine certo episcopatus loco constitui, atque ab uno episcopo episcopum sicut quemlibet presbyterum ordinari.' [This latter irregularity was characteristic of the Celtic Church, but the canonical rule seems to have been observed at Iona; cf. Bede *H. E.* iii. 17-22). So St. Bernard (*de vita S. Mal.* 10): 'nam, quod inauditum est ab ipso Christianitatis initio, sine ordine, sine ratione mutabantur et multiplicabantur episcopi pro libitu metropolitani, ita ut unus episcopatus uno non esset contentus, sed singulae paene ecclesiae singulos haberent episcopos.' He clearly does not understand the situation.

[1] Todd *St. Patrick* p. 5. Cf. *Vita S. Brigidae*, ed. Colgan in the *Triadis Thaumaturgae Acta*, p. 523; Adamnan *Vita S. Columbae* i. 36, ed. Fowler (Oxford, 1894), p. 47, cf. pp. xvii, xxxiv, xl.

principle of ministerial succession. Through all the different forms which the church ministry assumed, and they have been very various, this has been the constant principle. Never has it been supposed that the accident of ecclesiastical authority, apart from episcopal order, gave a man the power to ordain.[1]

The conception of the ministry in

It remains then to seek the light thrown upon the conception of the ministry in the West—

(1) by typical theologians after A.D. 150:[2]
(2) by the canons of councils:
(3) by the forms of ordination and by the writers on the church offices.

(1) Western Fathers:

(1) St. Cyprian, the great bishop of Carthage, stands out prominently among western writers who vindicated the claim of the apostolic ministry. It cannot be rightly maintained that he added anything new to the belief of his predecessors, western or eastern, in the visible unity of the Church or the authority of the episcopate. Nor did he bring these two doctrines into any new connexion; Ignatius and Irenaeus had already put the bishop in a very clear position in relation to church unity. Nor again is it true to say that Cyprian in any way created the doctrine of schism or destroyed an existing 'freedom of association' in the Church.[3] He did not in fact

Cyprian, c. A.D. 250;

[1] See App. Note E, p. 332, on some supposed cases of presbyterian ordination.

[2] Clement of Rome is therefore not yet in discussion. The conception of the ministry held by Irenaeus and Tertullian has been already exhibited, pp. 100-108; and the *Church Order* of Hippolytus has been dealt with as part of the Greek material, pp. 132-134. A further passage from Hippolytus is noticed in another connexion, App. Note G, p. 348.

[3] Dr. Hatch (*B. L.*[2] p. 103) has maintained that 'the rule [that "there should be only one bishop in a community"] was not firmly established until the third century. Its general recognition was the outcome of the dispute between Cyprian and Novatian.' 'For this assertion,' said Dr. Salmon truly, 'he offers no proof whatever. Cyprian certainly treats it as a monstrous and impious thing, that when one bishop had been duly elected another should be ordained; but there is no evidence that this view was then either novel or singular. Novatian no doubt had a respectable following, but there is no evidence that he claimed to be anything less than *the* bishop of Rome, or that either he or any of those who acknowledged him as bishop of Rome acknowledged Cornelius also as bishop' (*Expositor*, July 1887, p. 8 n.[1]). The opposite is in fact quite plain: cf. the letters of Cornelius to Fabius and of

create or innovate, but he gave emphatic expression to an existing church principle in view of the particular circumstances of his episcopate.

The Church is one, then,—this is his position—with a visible external unity. The essence of that unity lies indeed in a spiritual fact—the life of Christ which is communicated to the Church: but this life is communicated to a visible society, bound together by visible bonds of external association.[1] To this visible society he that would be Christ's must belong; 'he cannot have God for his father who has not the Church for his mother.'[2] The sin of schism separates from Christ in such completeness that not even martyrdom can expiate it.[3] Of this unity the

Dionysius to Novatian, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43, 45. The Novatianist confessors clearly imply that there was no question of acknowledging both: see their profession ap. Cyprian *Ep.* xlix. To go back a long way before Cyprian, it is surely of the essence of Ignatius' conception that there should be but 'one bishop' in each community.

Of course difficulties may have arisen in particular cases in determining what constituted a community. Ordinarily, no doubt, the civil 'civitas' became the ecclesiastical 'parish'; but there must have been situations hard to deal with under this rule. Thus Lightfoot is very possibly right in regarding Hippolytus as neither strictly bishop of Portus nor bishop of Rome, but an 'assistant bishop' to the see of Rome, an ἐπίσκοπος ἐθνῶν, dealing with the mixed population of various nationalities at Portus, the port of Rome, and traditionally associated therefore with that place, see *S. Clement of Rome* vol. ii. pp. 427 ff.; cf. also Dr. Salmon in *Dict. Chr. Biog.* s.v. HIPPOLYTUS iii. pp. 90, 91. But such a position would have been exceptional.

Harnack appends to his translation of Hatch's work (*Die Gesellschaftsverfassung etc.* p. 252) a note in disagreement, in the above sense: 'Ich kenne überhaupt keinen Grund, der gegen die Annahme spricht, dass sich die Regel, in jeder Stadt sei stets nur *ein* katholischer Bischof zu dulden, bereits am Ende des zweiten Jahrhunderts festgestellt hat.' Dr. Hatch in his later work *The Growth of Church Institutions* (1887, p. 17), quoted in support of his view some words of Epiphanius: οὐ γάρ ποτε ἡ Ἀλεξάνδρεια δύο ἐπισκόπους ἔσχεν ὡς αἱ ἄλλαι πόλεις (*adv. Haer.* lxviii. 7). But the second bishop here spoken of as existing in other churches of *Egypt* but not at Alexandria is the schismatic Meletian bishop. The Meletian schism is the subject of the whole section, and the context leaves no doubt as to the meaning. On the subject of this note see *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1888, 'Ancient and Modern Church Organization' [reprinted in C. H. Turner *Studies in Early Church History*, 1912, pp. 33-70].

[1] Cf. *de Unit. Eccles.* 5: 'Ecclesia Domini luce perfusa per orbem totum radios suos porrigit; unum tamen lumen est quod ubique diffunditur, nec unitas corporis separatur: ramos suos in universam terram copia ubertatis extendit, profluentes largiter rivos latius pandit; unum tamen caput est et origo una et una mater fecunditatis successibus copiosa.'

[2] *Ep.* lxxiv. 7 (quoted above, p. 14 n.[1], with other passages).

[3] *de Unit. Eccles.* 14. Great light is thrown on Cyprian's conception of the sin of schism, so far as concerns the relations of different churches, by his subsequent attitude towards Stephen of Rome. He would no doubt have said that the sin

bishop is in each community at once the symbol,[1] the guardian,[2] and the instrument. He is the instrument of it because 'the bishops, who succeed to the Apostles by an ordination which makes them their representatives,' are the possessors of that sacerdotal authority and grace with which Christ endowed His Church, and which is necessary for her existence.[3] This plenitude of the priesthood [4] is in every bishop, and in every bishop equally, just as every one of the Apostles was 'endowed with an equal fellowship of

of schism in the case of any division lies with the church from which the unjust claim proceeds which causes the division. Stephen made such a claim, i.e. a claim affecting the independence of the churches of Africa in an open question, and endeavoured to enforce it by an excommunication which Cyprian and the Africans ignored. 'Make no mistake,' wrote St. Firmilian of Caesarea, speaking of Stephen, 'you have excommunicated yourself' (ap. Cypr. *Ep.* lxxv. 24). It is to be remarked that St. Augustin makes St. Cyprian in this matter the type of the unschismatical temper, because, while he maintained the independent judgment of the African churches, he did not break off communion with those who differed from them; but, as far as in him lay, remained at unity with them in spite of differences (*de Bapt.* v. 25 [36]). Augustin is following Jerome in this, who commends Cyprian on the same grounds (*adv. Lucifer.* 25: 'non cum anathemate eorum qui se sequi noluerant').

[1] *Ep.* xliii. 5: 'Deus unus est et Christus unus et una ecclesia et cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui aut sacerdotium novum fieri praeter unum altare et unum sacerdotium non potest.'

[2] *de Unit. Eccles.* 5: 'Quam unitatem tenere firmiter et vindicare debemus, maxime episcopi qui in ecclesia praesidemus, ut episcopatum quoque ipsum unum atque indivisum probemus.'

[3] *Ep.* lxvi. 8: 'Unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo et si qui cum episcopo non sit in ecclesia non esse.' *ib.* 4, 5: '[Christus] dicit ad apostolos ac per hoc ad omnes praepositos qui apostolis vicaria ordinatione succedunt: Qui audit vos, me audit . . . qui reicit vos, me reicit . . . Unde enim schismata et haereses obortae sunt et oriuntur? dum episcopus qui unus est et ecclesiae praest superba quorundam praesumptione contemnitur et homo dignatione Dei honoratus indignus hominibus iudicatur.' *Ep.* xxxiii. 1: 'Dominus noster, cuius praecepta metuere et servare debemus, episcopi honorem et ecclesiae suae rationem disponens in evangelio loquitur et dicit Petro: Ego tibi dico quia tu es Petrus, et super istam petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, et portae inferorum non vincent eam, et tibi dabo claves regni caelorum, et quae ligaveris *etc.* . . . Inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiae ratio decurrit, ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur et omnis actus ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernetur. Cum hoc ita divina lege fundatum sit, miror quosdam audaci temeritate sic mihi scribere voluisse ut ecclesiae nomine litteras facerent, quando ecclesia in episcopo et clero et in omnibus stantibus sit constituta.'

[4] As having this plenitude of the priesthood, the word sacerdos is generally used of the bishop; but the presbyter also has sacerdotal powers. Cyprian speaks of our Lord as 'adorning the body of the presbyterate with glorious priests,' when the presbyter and confessor Numidicus was enrolled among the Carthaginian clergy (*Ep.* xl.). Cyprian did not draw out the analogy of bishop, priest, and deacon to high-priest, priest, and Levite of the O.T. See Benson's *Cyprian* (Macmillan, 1897) pp. 31-41.

honour and power.' But the apostolate, which was finally given to all equally, was given first to St. Peter, that by its being given first to one man, there might be emphasized for ever the unity which Christ willed to exist among the distinct branches or portions of His Church.[1] The episcopate which belongs to each bishop belongs to him as one of a great brotherhood linked by manifold ties into a corporate unity.[2]

A bishop stands, then, in various relations to the Church. In virtue of his election he represents his flock:[3] he is a part of the church and in a sense responsible to it and stands in a certain constitutional, though not clearly defined, relation to his presbyterate and the clergy generally. They are his recognised council, advisers, co-operators; he does nothing without consulting them.[4] But over and above this he represents divine authority. He is divinely appointed; he has not taken his honour upon himself.[5] Moreover, in the exercise of his

[1] *de Unit. Eccles.* 4: 'Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: Ego tibi dico, inquit, quia tu es Petrus *etc.* . . . Super unum aedificat ecclesiam, et quamvis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat et dicat: Sicut misit me Pater et ego mitto vos: accipite *etc.* . . . tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis eiusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur. Quam unam ecclesiam etiam in Cantico Canticorum Spiritus sanctus ex persona Domini designat et dicit: Una est columba mea.' *ib.* 5: 'Episcopatus unus est, cuius a singulis in solidum pars tenetur,' i.e. in such a way that each has the responsibility of the whole; the whole is in each.

[2] *Ep.* lv. 24: 'Cum sit a Christo una ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa, item episcopatus unus episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus.'

[3] 'Ecclesiam in episcopo esse,' *Ep.* lxvi. 8: cf. *Ep.* lv. 5, and *Dict. Chr. Biog.* i. p. 741.

[4] See above p. 89, and also Cyprian's letters to his presbyters, when in retirement, explaining the grounds on which he had ordained to the clergy without consultation; *Ep.* xxxviii. 1: 'In ordinationibus clericis, fratres carissimi, solemus vos ante consulere et mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare.' *Ep.* xxx. 5: 'collatione consiliorum cum episcopis, presbyteris, diaconis, confessoribus pariter ac stantibus laicis.' See *Epp.* xxix.; lxvii. 5.

[5] *Ep.* lxx. 3: 'Secundum [Domini] dignationem sacerdotium eius in ecclesia administramus.' *Ep.* lix. 5: 'Existimat aliquis summa et magna aut non sciente aut non permittente Deo in ecclesia Dei fieri, et sacerdotes, id est dispensatores eius, erunt non de eius sententia ordinati? . . . Plane episcopi non de voluntate Dei fiunt, sed qui extra ecclesiam fiunt.'

authority, he is responsible to no man outside his church but to God only. Cyprian does not explain, in connexion with this position, the meaning of the provincial council of which he made so much use. Presumably the provincial council has a certain authority over the individual bishop,[1] but none the less the independence of each bishop is asserted by Cyprian with unrestricted completeness.[2] His respect for the see of Rome, as being in a special historical sense—what every episcopate is essentially, as possessing the same authority—the see of Peter, will not go to the length of allowing it any jurisdiction over other churches. It may be in a special way the symbol of unity, as Peter was among the Apostles, but it is nothing more.[3]

[1] When a certain African bishop Therapius received back a lapsed presbyter into communion before the conditions laid down by conciliar authority, 'decreti nostri auctoritate,' had been satisfied, Cyprian and his colleagues in council content themselves with rebuking the bishop, 'obiurgare,' and directing him to do nothing of the kind in future, but they do not refuse communion to the presbyter thus improperly restored: *Ep.* lxiv. 1. St. Augustin expresses the gradations in the authority of bishop and of local and 'plenary' church councils in *de Bapt.* v. 22 [30].

[2] *Ep.* lxxii. 3: 'Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus, quando habeat in ecclesiae administratione voluntatis suae arbitrium liberum unusquisque praepositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus.' *Ep.* lxxiii. 26: 'nemini praescribentes aut praeiudicantes, quominus unusquisque episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem.'

[3] It is 'locus Petri,' 'Petri cathedra, ecclesia principalis, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est' (*Epp.* lv. 8, lix. 14). By these last words he means probably that the African succession came from Rome (so Puller *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*[2] p. 52). He goes on to assert the independent jurisdiction of each episcopate. Cf. Jerome *Ep.* cxlvi. *ad Evangelum*: 'Ubicumque fuerit episcopus sive Romae, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriae, sive Tanis, eiusdem meriti, eiusdem est et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum et paupertatis humilitas vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem episcopum non facit. Ceterum omnes apostolorum successores sunt.'

It is not the place here to discuss what effect this conception of the see of Peter, as in a special way the symbol and centre of unity, had on the development of Petrine claims. The conception reappears in the later Africans, St. Optatus of Mileum (*de Schism. Don.* ii. 2, vii. 3—with a more 'papal' tone, but cf. vi. 3) and St. Augustin; see *ABCDarium* (=*Psalmus contra partem Donati*) l. 229: 'Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede'; *c. epistolam Manichaei* 4: 'Multa sunt alia quae in [ecclesiae catholicae] gremio me iustissime teneant . . . tenet ab ipsa sede Petri apostoli, cui pascendas oves suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit, usque ad praesentem episcopatum successio sacerdotum.' Elsewhere he speaks of all the Apostles as the source of the succession: 'ecclesia ab ipso Christo inchoata et per apostolos provecta certa successionum serie usque ad haec tempora, toto terrarum orbe dilatata . . . ecclesia, quae ab ipso per apostolos succedentibus sibimet episcopis usque ad haec tempora propagata dilatatur' (*c. Faustum* xxviii. 2, 4).

This is the theory of the episcopate into which St. Cyprian poured all the force of his great character, all the dignity of his strong holiness, to make it a living reality. He stands out in church history as the typical bishop, and with his weighty sentences he impressed on the episcopal theory an abiding form.

Lucifer, C. A.D. 360;

Next to Cyprian, it will be well to quote a vivid expression of the principle of the succession from a bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia—that Lucifer who was Athanasius' friend, but whose impatience and violence led him at last into being the founder of a schismatical body. He is addressing Constantius the emperor out of his place of exile in Palestine and speaking of his nobler friend Athanasius.[1]

'You persecute the man,' he says, 'whom you ought to listen to. While he is still alive, you send to succeed him that George who is your partner in heresy, when, even if Athanasius had been set free from the body, it was not lawful for you to send any one, but it was and is in God's hand to appoint whom He thought proper as bishop of His people, and that through His servants the catholic bishops. For no man can be filled with the power of the Holy Ghost to govern God's people, save he whom God has chosen, and on whom hands have been laid by the catholic bishops, just as, when Moses was dead, we find his successor Joshua, the son of Nun, filled with the Holy Ghost; because, says Scripture, Moses had laid his hands upon him.'[2]

Ambrosiaster, Jerome, etc., C. A.D. 370-400.

Now we approach an interesting class of writings which represent a tendency in the western Church to minimize the position of the episcopate. There are,

[1] Whether he was himself ever actually separated from the Church is doubtful; see *Dict. Chr. Biog.* S.V. LUCIFER. His writings date from his exile.

[2] *de S. Athan.* I. 9: 'Persequeris eum per quem te audire praeceperit Dominus; agente eo in rebus humanis cohaereticum tuum Georgium mittis successorem, cum, tametsi fuisset liberatus iam Athanasius ex corpore, tibi non licuerit mittere, sed fuerit ac sit in Dei manu quem fuisset dignatus populo suo antistitem instituere per servos videlicet suos, hoc est catholicos episcopos. Neque enim posset impleri virtute Spiritus sancti ad Dei gubernandum populum nisi is quem Deus allegisset cuique manus per catholicos episcopos fuisset imposita, sicut defuncto Moyse impletum Spiritu sancto invenimus successorem eius Iesum Naue. Loquitur scriptura sancta dicens: Et Iesus filius Naue impletus est spiritu intellegentiae; imposuerat enim Moyses manum super eum; et audierunt eum filii Israel et fecerunt secundum quod mandavit Dominus Moysi. Conspicis ordinationi Dei te obviam isse contra Dei faciendo voluntatem, temet mucrone gladii tui iugulatum, siquidem non licuerit ordinari nisi fuisset defunctus Athanasius, et defuncto Athanasio catholicus debuerit per catholicos ordinari episcopos.'

first, the Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles, the author of which, commonly called Ambrosiaster, wrote in Damasus' episcopate at Rome.[1] Whoever he was, he was a man of mental power and spiritual insight—'brief in words, but weighty in matter,'—and, one must add, of a rather sharply critical spirit. Secondly, we have some Questions on the Old and New Testament, once ascribed to Augustin, written at the same epoch and at the same place as the Commentaries, and in all probability by the same author.[2] Thirdly, there is Jerome, who expresses the same sentiments as the other writer or writers, but at a later date, apparently when he had become thoroughly disgusted with the church at Rome, and had changed his earlier tone towards it and its clergy.[3] It must be added that Jerome's sentiments

[1] 'Cuius [ecclesiae] hodie rector est Damasus' (*in 1 Tim.* iii. 14). When St. Augustin quoted from the Commentaries as from 'sanctus Hilarius' (*c. duas epp. Pelagianorum* iv. 7), he presumably meant St. Hilary of Poitiers; and as his authorship is of course out of the question, the only conclusion we can draw is that the work was published anonymously and so came to be attributed to the illustrious theologian of the previous generation who had written commentaries on the Psalms and on St. Matthew. Other explanations of the name Hilary would identify him (i) with the Sardinian deacon attached to the party of Lucifer, or (ii) with a distinguished layman Decimius Hilarianus Hilarius. But by far the most probable solution of the problem of the authorship is Dom Morin's suggestion of the ex-Jew Isaac, a partisan of Damasus' rival Ursinus (*Revue d'hist. et de lit. relig.* iv. 97 [1899]): for we could then account both for Jerome's silence in general about this commentator, and for his enigmatic reference to a Jewish-Christian exegete, *in Tit.* iii. 9. Morin afterwards retracted his suggestion in favour of Hilarianus Hilarius: on the other hand, Prof. A. Souter of Aberdeen, who in his *Study of Ambrosiaster* had adopted Morin's second view, reverted in his edition of the *Quaestiones* (Vienna C.S.E.L. vol. l, 1908) to the authorship of Isaac, and this is the theory which now holds the field.

[2] He wrote at Rome (*Qu.* cxv; cf. his polemic against Roman deacons in *Qu.* ci; the 'we' who are opposed to the Romans in *Qu.* lxxxiv are probably the Christians—see Langen *Gesch. der röm. Kirche* i. p. 600), about 300 years after the destruction of Jerusalem under Vespasian (*Qu.* xliv) i.e. A.D. 370-380. He was seemingly a priest—'sacerdos Dei et praepositus plebis' (*Qu.* cxx); and we gather that he was a presbyter from his polemics against deacons and depreciation of bishops (*Qu.* ci). Dom Morin, in the article referred to in the preceding note, holds him to be certainly the same man as 'Ambrosiaster.'

[3] In Jerome's earlier years his tone is papal, e.g. in his letters to Damasus from the East A.D. 375-380 (*Epp.* xv., xvi.). Afterwards, disgusted with Roman manners and disappointed of the Roman episcopate, he broke with the church there A.D. 385, and his abusive tone about the Roman clergy is subsequent to this date, e.g. *Ep.* lii. *ad Nepotianum* is after A.D. 393. His letter to Evangelus (*Ep.* cxlvi.) is marked by its hostile tone towards Rome as being probably subsequent at any rate to A.D. 385, and *Ep.* lxix. *ad Oceanum* is about A.D. 400. His Commentaries on the New Testament, which contain the passages minimizing the episcopal office by comparison

passed into the writings of some later western authors.[1]

These last writers (*a*) are sacerdotal;

What then is it that these writers teach about the ministry? First, it must be said that they in no way minimize the sacerdotal character of the ministry. Jerome indeed sometimes appears as an extreme sacerdotalist; and if the unknown Commentator is not that, at least he gives us a substantial view of the priestly function. 'Layings-on of hands [i.e. ordinations],' he says, 'are mystical words, by which the selected man is confirmed for this work, receiving authority, so that he should venture in the Lord's place to offer sacrifice to God.' 'That,' says St. Jerome, 'can be no Church which has no priest.'[2]

(*b*) do not dispute the exclusive powers of bishops in their day,

Next, neither of these writers disputes the present authority of the threefold ministry or the limitation to bishops of the power of ordination. They do not maintain that, even in the extremest circumstances, a presbyter—a presbyter of the existing Church—could validly ordain. Thus the Commentator is emphatic 'that none of the clergy, who has not been ordained to it, should take to himself any office which he knows not to have been intrusted or granted to him'; in spite, that is, of what may have been the primitive practice. 'It never was lawful or permitted,' he says again, 'that an inferior should ordain a superior, for nobody gives what he has not received.' 'All orders are in the bishop'; 'the dignity of all ordinations is in the bishop.' 'What does a bishop do,' says St. Jerome, even when he is minimizing the episcopate, 'that a presbyter does

with the presbyterate, belong to the period A.D. 386-392. Yet even in his earlier tract against the Luciferians he speaks ironically of bishops and of the need of assigning to them special privileges, *Dialogus adv. Luciferianos* 9.

[1] See App. Note F, p. 337 f. 'S. Hieronymi sententia,' says Morinus (*de S. Ord.* pars iii. ex. iii. 2. 19), 'universae ecclesiae Latinae acceptissima fuit et immerito a multis theologis cum gravi censura repudiata: imprudentes enim cum S. Hieronymo universam prope ecclesiam Latinam condemnarunt.'

[2] For all quotations from these writers, see App. Note F.

not do, *except ordination*?' The bishop and the presbyter are to one another as the high priest and priest of the old covenant.

or since the Apostles;

Once more, they do not regard the present three-fold arrangement of the ministry as an innovation of the post-apostolic Church, so that it should lack the authority of the Apostles. The present constitution represents *their* ordering. Nay, according to the Commentator, it represents more: 'because all things are from one God the Father, He hath decreed that each church should be presided over by one bishop.'

only they maintain that presbyters were at first also bishops,

Jerome, however, seems to hold that, while Christ instituted only one priestly office, it was the exigencies of church life which led to its being sub-divided under apostolic sanction into the presbyterate and the episcopate. At any rate, whether the distinction was 'ordained by Christ Himself' or of apostolic authority, these writers were agreed that (as the names 'bishop' and 'presbyter' are used in the New Testament of the same officers) the presbyters originally were also bishops, and it was because of the dangers of rivalry and division which threatened this arrangement from the first that it was determined that in future only one person should have the authority and name of the episcopate, the rest receiving only the commission of presbyters.[1] How much truth there is in this view is not now in question. They thought also that this original identity of the presbyterate and episcopate had left its mark on the subsequent constitution of the Church in such sense that presbyters and bishops still share a common priesthood, and that (waiving the question of confirmation[2]) there is nothing which is reserved

and somewhat minimize the subsequent difference.

[1] Jerome affirmed, as has been said (p. 118), that the old constitution had in a measure been maintained at Alexandria down to the third century.

[2] Throughout the Church, in West and East alike, the consecration of the chrism was strictly reserved to bishops: throughout the Church also the administration of

to a bishop except the function of ordination.[1] Jerome used this view with powerful effect to exalt the priesthood of the presbyter, as against the arrogance of Roman deacons on the one hand, and on the other against the overweening self-assertion of bishops. It was a bad custom, he thought, which prevailed in some churches, that presbyters should not be allowed to preach in the presence of bishops.[2] The bishops' exalted dignity is a thorn in Jerome's side; 'as if they were placed in some lofty watch-tower, they scarcely deign to look at us mortals or to speak to their fellow-servants.'[3] A priest should indeed be subject to his bishop [pontifiex] as to his spiritual father, but 'bishops should know that they are priests, not lords, and they must give their clergy the honour of clergy, if they wish their clergy to pay them the honour of bishops.'[4] This is the animus in Jerome's theory.[5]

Now when we have clearly considered this view, we shall see surely that it is not what it is sometimes represented as being. It is not a 'presbyterian' view. It does indeed carry with it the conception

the chrism so consecrated was allowed to presbyters. But West and East differed as to the place assigned to chrism in the rites of baptism and confirmation. In the East chrism early became the essential part of confirmation, and therefore a presbyter could confirm—the actual presence of the bishop was not necessary: see the citations from Ambrosiaster as to the Egyptian use, p. 119 *supra*. On the other hand in the West chrism was a regular element in baptism, and confirmation meant the subsequent laying on of the bishop's hands (with chrism) on the forehead. Thus the part of the bishop in relation to confirmation in the East was his part in relation to baptism in the West, namely, the implication of his authority through the distribution of the consecrated chrism. So St. Jerome, *Dial. adv. Luciferianos* (written at Rome) 9, recognises this dual position of the bishop, his direct right over confirmation, in the sense that under no circumstances, not even of imminent death, could a presbyter confirm, and his indirect control—subject of course to exceptions in case of necessity—over baptism, 'inde venit ut sine chrismate et episcopi iussione neque presbyter neque diaconus ius habeant baptizandi.' On the doctrine of the 'matter' and 'form' of confirmation reference should be made to the excellent work of Fr. O'Dwyer (Dublin, Gill and Son, 1915) *Confirmation*.

[1] Cf. Chrysostom (p. 147 n.[1]) and Canons of Hippolytus (p. 135).

[2] *Ep.* lii. *ad Nepot.* 7: 'Pessimae consuetudinis est in quibusdam ecclesiis tacere presbyteros et praesentibus episcopis non loqui.'

[3] *in Gal.* iv. 13. [4] *Ep.* lii. 7.

[5] 'S. Hieronymus in aestu contentionis indulgere solet exaggerationibus rhetoricis' (Morinus).

of the great Church order being the priesthood; it emphasizes that the distinction of presbyter and bishop is nothing compared to the distinction of deacon and priest. Moveover, it involves a certain tentativeness in the process by which the Apostles are held to have established the church ministry; it admits a survival of an older constitution into the later life of the Church. But it does not carry with it the idea that the presbyter, pure and simple, the presbyter of the settled church constitution, has the power under any circumstances to assume episcopal functions. It teaches something quite different, viz. that the earliest presbyters were ordained with episcopal functions—were, in fact, bishops as well as presbyters—till the subsequent ordination of presbyters without episcopal functions put an end to the old arrangement and brought about—not episcopacy—but what we have called monepiscopacy.[1] St. Paul, says the Commentator, passes from the ordination of bishops to that of deacons, because the ordination of a bishop and a presbyter is the same.[2] But this 'is' must be an 'historical present.' The ordinations of a bishop and a presbyter were wholly distinct in his day. 'In our day,' he says, a few lines further on, 'there should be in a city seven deacons and a certain number of presbyters and one bishop.' Church authority had in fact restrained to one the functions which at first were more widely extended, and no one can at all enter into the feelings of the early Church about ordination who does not perceive how much stress they laid on church authority, as conditioning a man's spiritual status.[3]

This view not unacceptable.

[1] See Thomassin *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina* pars i. lib. i. c. 1. § 6.

[2] *In* 1 *Tim.* iii. 10: see App. Note F, p. 336.

[3] Morinus sees the more modern representation of Jerome's view in the scholastic opinion that the episcopate does not differ from the presbyterate in *sacerdotal character*, but is an *extension* of the same character by the addition of a new authority. The consecration of a bishop does not impose a new *character*, but only superadds a new authority. See *de S. Ord.* pars iii. ex. iii. c. 1.

(2) Canons of councils.

(2) We need not dwell long on the western councils. After the Carthaginian council in 256 A.D., which simply echoes the mind of Cyprian on the rebaptism of heretics and only gives us evidence we hardly need that Cyprian's view of the bishop's office was also the view of his colleagues, the record of western councils opens with that of Elvira (Illiberis) in Andalusia, which occurred in the early years of the fourth century, and that of Arles—a representative western council[1]—in A.D. 314. Both these councils assume as a matter of course the sacerdotal ministry of the Church and the three orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons.[2] So far as they are concerned with the ministry, they are occupied only with the maintenance of discipline and the regulation of inter-episcopal relations.[3]

(3) Latin liturgies indicate

(3) When we turn to the Latin rites of ordination, we find a constant implication of the doctrine of the

[1] Augustin even calls it a 'plenarium ecclesiae universae concilium.'

[2] Episcopi, presbyteres et diacones (Elvira, cc. 18, 19; cf. 27, 75, and Arles, cc. 20, 21): clerical office a status (Elvira, c. 53): the bishops sacerdotes (Elvira, c. 48): the sacerdotal function offerre (Arles, c. 19).

[3] E.g. there is the restraining of deacons in Arles, c. 18, whose arrogance we hear of first in Cyprian's letters (*Ep.* iii. 3: the deacon must 'honorem sacerdotis [i.e. of the bishop] agnoscere'). Deacons had been known even to offer the Eucharist in many places, and this is curtly reprimanded: cf. Arles, c. 15 [16] 'De diaconibus quos cognovimus multis locis offerre, placuit minime fieri debere.' (There is no reason whatever for thinking that this represents any remains of an earlier discipline. How in days of persecution such an abuse should have sprung up is intelligible enough. It must be remembered that the fourth century is full of lament over the decay of discipline, as e.g. in Basil the Great, *Ep.* xc.). In Spain there is no trace of such a licence, but we hear of deacons in charge of congregations, as in later ages, and Elvira c. 77 enacts thus: 'Si quis diaconus regens plebem sine episcopo vel presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debebit [i.e. confirm]; quod si ante de saeculo recesserint, sub fide qua quis credidit poterit esse iustus.'

Elvira c. 32 restrains to bishops the function of dealing with penitents; only in cases of necessity may a presbyter admit to communion, or even a deacon, if the bishop (sacerdos) order him. Cf. Carthage, A.D. 390, ec. 3, 4, Hippo Regius, A.D. 393, c. 30 (=Carthage iii. c. 32).

Other canons concern clerical discipline (Elvira, c. 33, Arles, c. 2); the mutual relation of bishops (Elvira, cc. 53, 58, Arles, c. 17); the requirement of at least three bishops to consecrate another (Arles, c. 20); the permission, in sickness, of lay baptism, to be followed, in case of recovery, by episcopal confirmation (Elvira, c. 38).

We notice specially in later councils (e.g. Carthage, A.D. 390, c. 3; Hippo, A.D. 393, c. 34 (=Carthage iii. c. 36); Toledo, A.D. 400, c. 20) the limitation to bishops of the consecration of the chrism. There was clearly a tendency in the presbyters to assume this function.

priesthood, and of the orders in the ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons.[1] The distinction between these and the minor orders is marked in the West by the subdeacon not receiving the laying-on of hands.[2] It should be noticed in this connexion that the uniformity of idea which pervades the various rites of ordination (and in this respect we may include the Greek with the Latin) makes a great impression upon the mind. It is not indeed the case that there is no change of ideas, but it is not in any way fundamental. The conception of the Christian pastorate and priesthood in succession to the apostles is the constant element.

(*a*) increase in ritual, not in doctrine;

Such change as appears is mainly of two sorts. There is, first, the elaboration of ritual. It is important indeed to remind ourselves that a more elaborate ritual of ordination does not necessarily mean a deepening of the conception of what ordination brings with it. The earliest writing devoted to the consideration of a Christian sacrament—Tertullian's treatise *On Baptism*—is as full of belief in the spiritual effect of the laver of regeneration as any treatise of a mediaeval schoolman could be; but he makes it his special point that it is on account of the real spiritual efficacy of Christian sacraments that they do not need to be made impressive by outward pomp. They can be simple, because they have so real an inward grace attached to them. It is pagan rites which need decking out with pomp and circumstance, just because they have nothing else to trust

[1] This statement is justified in App. Note C, pp. 323 ff. The episcopate is called an ordo (episcopatus ordo) in the Gregorian Sacramentary (ed. Muratori *Lit. Rom. Vet.* ii. p. 358, or H. A. Wilson *Henry Bradshaw Society* vol. xlix. p. 6).

[2] See the Gallican canons or *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua* (wrongly called the fourth council of Carthage) c. 5, quoted below p. 169 n.[2] Cf. Isidore *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 10 ap. Hittorp. p. 23 [ed. 1591, p. 20]: 'hi [sc. subdiacones] igitur cum ordinantur, sicut sacerdotes et levitae, manus impositionem non suscipiunt': copied by Rabanus Maurus *de Inst. Cler.* i. 8 ap. Hittorp. p. 316 [ed. 1591, p. 268].

to for impressing men's minds.[1] The belief in baptismal grace, then, did not grow with the elaboration of baptismal ceremony. Just in the same way it does not follow that, because ordination rites became more complicated, the Christian Church was growing to rate more highly the consecration which they conveyed. To the last there remains in the western office a reminder that, while outward pomp was of the essence of the old priesthood, for the very reason that that was essentially external and symbolical, the essence of the new priesthood lies in inward and spiritual reality. The prayer for the consecration of a bishop calls to mind the glory of the vestments of the Aaronic priesthood, and prays that whatever those vestments signified by the brilliancy of gold, by the splendour of gems, by the variety of manifold workmanship, may shine forth now in the *characters* of Christian bishops, and that the precious ointment upon the head which runs down unto the beard and goes down to the skirts of the clothing may be to them the unction within, and even without, of spiritual grace and spiritual power.[2]

(*b*) a growing independence in the priesthood of the presbyter.

Secondly, beside ritual adjuncts there is a certain change in idea noticeable in the rites of ordination. It consists chiefly in emphasizing the special sacerdotal functions of the *presbyter*. Thus in the later forms we have the commissions to the priest: 'Receive power to offer sacrifice'; 'Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost remit, they are remitted,

[1] The passage, *de Bapt.* 2, is well worth quoting. 'Nihil adeo est, quod tam obduret mentes hominum, quam simplicitas divinorum operum quae in actu videtur et magnificentia quae in effectu repromittitur: ut hic quoque quoniam tanta simplicitate sine pompa, sine apparatu novo aliquo, denique sine sumptu, homo in aqua demissus et inter pauca verba tinctus non multo vel nihilo mundior resurgit, eo incredibilis existimetur consecutio aeternitatis. Mentior, si non e contrario idolorum sollemnia vel arcana de suggestu et apparatu deque sumptu fidem et auctoritatem sibi exstruunt. Pro misera incredulitas, quae denegas Deo proprietates suas, simplicitatem et potestatem!'

[2] See App. Note C, p. 326.

etc.' Now these later forms are significant. There is indeed nothing new in the conception of sacrifice or of the power of absolution as belonging to the priesthood, nor is any new idea involved in the imperative form of commission; what is new is the specification of them, and especially of the latter, in the case of the presbyter. It belongs to a stage of church organization in which the presbyter is regarded as having a more independent priesthood, attaching to him as an individual. In earlier days the priesthood is kept more closely in connexion with the church or community. In the church or community the high-priest or bishop exercises the sacerdotal and pastoral functions, and the presbyters are attached to him as 'co-operators of his order.' This idea of co-operation is what is remarkably emphasized in the early prayers for their ordination. Later—owing to the more independent position which the circumstances of large dioceses gave to the presbyter—his substantive priesthood, inhering in him as an individual, comes more to the front. A presbyter is not so much a man who occupies a certain position and grade in the hierarchy of the community; he is an individual with special powers. His priesthood has become detached.[1]

Conclusion for the history from A.D. 150.

Now the evidence which early Christian history affords for the position of the ministry has been passed in review. If reference is made to the five positions which were enunciated at the beginning of this chapter, it will be found that the two first—to go at present no further—have been thoroughly justified. Everywhere we have found a ministry, recognised as having authority by succession from the Apostles: everywhere the three distinct orders of bishop,

(i) the principle of apostolic succession accepted:

[1] The general conception of what, in the view of the writers of the first systematic treatises on 'Church Offices' (from the seventh to the ninth century), belonged, or did not belong, to the presbyter's office will be found illustrated in the quotations at the end of Note F, pp. 338, 339.

(ii) an episcopate, with exclusive powers of ordination, universal.

presbyter, and deacon: everywhere the limitation to the episcopate of the power of ordination. The only qualification which has to be made lies in the recognition that a school of western writers held that *originally* there had been no substantial distinction between a bishop and presbyter; and one of these writers affirms, in effect, that this state of things continued in the church of Alexandria into the third century. It has however been pointed out that in the view of these writers, so long as the presbyters were understood to have episcopal powers (either generally or under certain circumstances), there was no separate ordination to the episcopate.[1] They do not hold that episcopal functions could under any circumstances be assumed by the later presbyters of the settled church constitution, who have been ordained as presbyters and nothing more, and would require a separate ordination to make them bishops.

Evidence produced.

Some further points have still to be made good in order to justify the remaining positions which we enunciated at starting (p. 99).

III. That ordination was regarded sacramentally,

III. The Church did from the first, we maintain, regard ordination as a 'sacramental'[2] rite, to which was attached a special authorization or grace, of

[1] That a man should pass from one grade of the church ministry up to another was early recognised as the normal and canonical method; see *Apost. Const.* viii. 17 (based on 1 Tim. iii. 13) and the council of Sardica can. 8 [13]. But ordinations *per saltum*, and especially of deacons to the episcopate, were known and recognised in early days. See Denny and Lacey *de hierarchia Anglicana* p. 104.

[2] I use this expression without exact definition of a sacrament. The conception of ordination, for example, given by Rabanus Maurus *de Inst. Cler.* i. 4-7, is sacramental in the sense that the laying-on of episcopal hands is regarded as an act conferring certain mystical powers. Yet when he comes to speak (c. 24) of the sacraments of the Church, he reckons two only: 'Sunt sacramenta baptismum et chrisma, corpus et sanguis, quae ob id sacramenta dicuntur, quia sub tegumento corporalium rerum virtus divina secretius salutem eorundem sacramentorum operatur: unde et a secretis virtutibus vel sacris sacramenta dicuntur. Quae ideo fructuose penes ecclesiam fiunt, quia sanctus in ea manens Spiritus eundem sacramentorum latenter operatur effectum.' Earlier, however, St. Augustin had in substantially this sense spoken freely of ordination as a sacrament. But I want to avoid, as much as possible, the history of terminology.

which the laying-on of hands was the 'outward sign.' On the other hand it was urged by Dr. Hatch that the idea of 'ordination' in the earliest Church carried with it only the association of official appointment, such as belonged to contemporary secular society. The words by which it is described 'were in use to express appointment to civil office. When other ideas than those of civil appointment came beyond question to attach themselves to ecclesiastical appointment other words were used.'[1]

This is a strange argument in view of the history of Christian terminology. 'Ecclesia' was a common term enough in the Greek language; but did it carry to St. Paul no special Christian associations? 'To break bread,' 'to give thanks,' were common terms; but 'the bread which we break,' St. Paul says, 'is the communion of the body of Christ.' 'Baptism' had common enough associations in connexion with pots and cups, brazen vessels and tables; but we could not therefore argue that it was only when the sacrament of initiation came to be known as 'the enlightenment' or 'the salvation,' that associations of spiritual power began to be attached to it.[2] It is the earliest Christian writings that are most suggestive in this respect. It is the simplicity of the language in which Tertullian speaks of Christian baptism and Justin describes the Christian Eucharist, which throws into high relief the profound conception which they entertained of their spiritual efficacy.[3] So far as technical language is concerned, certainly

[1] Dr. Hatch *B. L.*[2] p. 129. In notes 33 and 34 he says: 'The words in use in the first three centuries are χειροτονεῖν, καθιστάνειν, κληροῦσθαι, *constituere, ordinare* . . . After the first three centuries there were not only other words of the same kind, e.g. προελθεῖν, προάγεσθαι, *promoveri, praeferri*, but also χειροθετεῖσθαι, ἱερᾶσθαι, *consecrari, benedici*.

[2] Bingham *Ant.* xi. 1. §§ 4, 5.

[3] Tertullian is quoted above p. 164. Justin Martyr's account of the Eucharist is studiedly simple. There is no term which is not of common life, yet he concludes with the well-known passage: 'We receive it not as common bread and common drink, but . . . we have been taught that the food . . . is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh' (*Apol.* i. 65, 66).

Christianity poured new wine into old bottles. Accordingly, it will not at all surprise us that the author of the Acts should speak simply of Paul and Barnabas 'appointing' elders in every Church (*χειροτονεῖν*, Acts xiv. 23), or that St. Paul should leave Titus to 'appoint' elders (*καθιστάναι*, Tit. i. 5); and that we should elsewhere be, as it were, let into the secret of such 'appointment' by St. Paul attributing it to the Holy Ghost (Acts xx. 28), and speaking to Timothy of the gift or special endowment of the Spirit 'which was in him by means of the laying-on of his hands' (2 Tim. i. 6, 7).

and conferred by laying-on of hands.

We may recognise, further, that in the whole process of her ordinations the Church seems to have borrowed a good many elements from the civil society round about her. The elements of appointment to civil offices 'were nomination, election, approval, and the declaration of election by a competent officer' the 'renunciatio.' Then there was the 'usurpatio iuris'; the consul or praetor designate, for example, formally exercised his office and by exercising it entered upon its legal tenure.[1] Now some of the steps of this process belong to human nature and would reproduce themselves in all appointments; but it is impossible to avoid tracing back to this civil process some of the features of the Church's later forms of ordination. If election, testimony, examination, approval must necessarily have been there, yet we need not have found, as in fact we do, the 'renunciatio' to be an element in the ordination ceremony of the West, and still more of the East, though in characteristic Christian language.[2] Further, the reading of the Gospel by the newly-ordained deacon; the 'concelebration' of the newly-ordained priest; the celebration of the Eucharist and benedic-

[1] See Dr. Hatch *B. L.*[2] pp. 129-131; *Dict. Chr. Ant.* s.v. ORDINATION § ii. pp. 1503-1508.

[2] *Dict. Chr. Ant.* loc. cit. p. 1507; and below, App. Note C.

tion of oil by the newly-consecrated bishop;[1] the giving to the persons ordained to the minor or (much later) to the higher orders the 'instruments' of their ministry—all such ceremonies are probably enough the Christian form of the 'usurpatio iuris.'[2] But most or all of these features in the ordination ceremonies of East or West were additions of varying and uncertain date. As what stamped the Christian ministry from the first had been the idea of divine mission and authorization, so the rite which corresponds to this idea had been all along the central and characteristic rite. Derived from Jewish traditional practice but stamped by the Apostles with a new

[1] See the *Church Order* of Hippolytus, p. 133 *supra*.

[2] Morinus (*de S. Ord.* pars iii. ex. xi. c. 5) saw this, and seems to draw the right conclusion. He notes:

(1) The fundamental identity of the method of ordaining bishops, presbyters, and deacons in East and West.

(2) The divergence with reference to the minor orders as they grew up: in the East they were ordained with laying-on of hands, but in the West by the 'tradition of the instruments' of their office, with some appropriate injunction. (See, for the ordination of reader and subdeacon, the *Church Order* of Hippolytus—in this respect the *Ap. Constitutions* deserts its Roman prototype—and the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, quoted by Morinus pars ii. p. 260: 'subdiaconus cum ordinatur, quia manus impositionem non accipit, patenam de manu episcopi accipiat vacuam et calicem vacuum; de manu vero archidiaconi accipiat urceolum cum aqua et aquamanile ac manutergium': and so on for the other orders.) This he compares to the method of assuming civil or military office by adopting or receiving the 'insignia.' So e.g. Dio Cassius (*Hist. Rom.* lxviii. 16) speaks of the *giving of the sword* by the emperor as the method of appointing the praetorian prefect: ὅτε πρῶτον τῷ μέλλοντι τῶν δορυφόρων ἐπάρξειν τὸ ξίφος, ὁ παραζώννυσθαι αὐτὸν ἐχρῆν, ὥρεξεν, ἐγύμνωσέ τε αὐτὸ καὶ ἀνατείνας ἔφη· Λάβε τοῦτο τὸ ξίφος, ἵνα, ἂν μὲν καλῶς ἄρχω, ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ἂν δὲ κακῶς, κατ' ἐμοῦ αὐτῷ χρήσῃ. Reimar says in his note: 'hinc periphrasis praefecti praetorio ἐφ' ᾧ τὸ ξίφος ἦν, ap. Philostratum'; and gives references, quoting also 'cum insigne potestatis, uti mos est, pugionem daret' from Victor *Caes.* xiii. 9.

Morinus concludes that, whereas the higher spiritual orders which were derived from the Apostles were always conferred in East and West by the apostolic method (even though much later the 'traditio instrumentorum' was added in their case too), the minor orders, which were a gradual and utilitarian development, were imparted differently in East and West, and in the West by ceremonies suggested by the method of secular appointment. This would be borne out by the evidence adduced by Harnack connecting the development of the minor orders in Rome with the reorganization of civil offices (*Text. u. Untersuch.* ii. Band, Heft 5, pp. 97-103): 'Die römische Gemeinde es verstanden hat . . . brauchbare Elemente des römischen Sacral- und Staatswesens zu adoptiren.' He thinks the seven subdeacons were instituted, probably by Fabian, to equalize the diaconate—without losing the sacred number—with the fourteen newly-instituted curatores urbis. Certainly the church organization was developed closely on the lines of the imperial system, as convenience no doubt suggested.

significance, it was the laying-on of hands—accompanied no doubt from the first with a prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit—which consecrated and empowered the minister in the Christian Church for his pastoral charge.[1]

IV. That permanent 'character' was believed to accompany it:

IV. Now we approach the subject of what came to be called the 'indelible character' impressed by ordination. So far as church officers are elected representatives and ministers of the congregation, they would naturally be regarded, and all down church history have been regarded, as holding their place on terms of their good behaviour: the disorderly cleric has been deposed. But this does not exhaust the matter. The church officer is also a representative of God: his ordination has given him a divine commission and gift of grace; and as 'the gifts and calling of God are without repentance,' so from this point of view it is necessary to regard him who is once a priest as always a priest, whether he adorn his office or no.[2] The later doctrine of the 'indelible character' impressed by ordination in common with baptism and confirmation, and the clearly drawn distinction between *valid* and *canonical*

[1] The 'laying-on of hands' in the Old Testament appears with a double significance. (*a*) When the people laid their hands upon the Levites, when the priest or the sacrificer laid his hand on the victim, the ceremony meant that the subject of it was made a *representative*—a substitute (Numb. viii. 10; Levit. xvi. 21, iii. 2-15, iv. 4-29). The Levites were to represent the people; the victim was taken as a substitute for the offerer. (*b*) It expressed the idea of *benediction* (Gen. xlviii. 14), and so specially it is used of Moses consecrating Joshua (Numb. xxvii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9, 'Joshua was full of the spirit of wisdom, for Moses had laid his hands upon him'). It also became, before our Lord's time, the Jewish mode of appointing magistrates and rabbis (Morinus *de S. Ord.* pars iii. ex. vii. c. 4), and they laid stress upon a *succession from Moses* (*ib.* § 8). The characteristic use of it in the New Testament (apart from its use in healing, which however is symbolical) is by the Apostles to convey the gift of the Holy Ghost (Acts viii. 17, xix. 6). Cf. the way in which the apostolic succession is connected with the Jewish in the Clementine *Ep. Petri ad Iacobum*. See further, for the evidence and significance of the rite in the Christian Church, App. Note G, p. 340.

[2] Harnack states the conditions of the problem well in modification of Dr. Hatch (*Die Gesellschaftsverfassung, etc.* p. 234 n.[13]): 'As far as concerns the bishops and deacons, their activity was almost without control and *ranked as charismatic*. This, without any doubt, is why the officers in the Christian communities occupied from the beginning a position so wholly different from that held by the officers in the θίασοι, or guilds.'

ordinations, were the final outcome in the West of the conflict between these two principles involved from the first in the position of the Christian ministry.

We see these opposite principles at work in St. Clement's Epistle. On the one hand, because the presbyterate has been appointed from above and has a divine authority, it is declared to be 'no light sin to cast out of their episcopate those who have holily and blamelessly offered the gifts.'[1] On the other hand, it is implied that had these holders of the sacred office been bad men, the Church, with whose consent they had been elected, might have deposed them from their charge. When Callistus, bishop of Rome early in the third century, repudiates this idea, —issuing his edict that 'if a bishop sin, though it be a sin unto death, he may not be removed'—he is, if correctly reported, stating the 'indelibility of ordination character'[2] in a form against which the canonical depositions of bishops, all down church history, are a continuous protest.

In what sense then did the early Christian Church hold this doctrine? In such sense, first of all, that there is no record from the beginning of church history of the reordination of any one episcopally ordained in the Church. Just as with baptism, so with ordination, questions were raised from time to time as to the conditions that were necessary to ensure the full efficacy of the act, and for the one as for the other the line tended to be drawn more narrowly in the earlier centuries than it was afterwards. But so soon as it was admitted that the conditions of a true ordination to a particular office,

[1] Clem. *ad Cor.* 44.

[2] Harnack *op. cit.* p. 258. The words are (Hippolytus *Ref. Omn. Haer.* ix. 12): οὗτος ἐδογμάτισεν ὅπως εἴ ἐπίσκοπος ἁμάρτοι τι, εἰ καὶ πρὸς θάνατον, μὴ δεῖν κατατίθεσθαι. Of course it must be remembered that we have only Hippolytus' statement to go by, and that he was concerned to represent Callistus in the worst light possible.

of bishop or priest or deacon, had been fulfilled, then ordination to that office could no more be repeated than could baptism. Reordination is, strictly, as inaccurate a term as rebaptism: for no one ever practised either except on the ground that anything that had preceded was no true baptism or no true ordination. Once let a man be ordained to any office, and his ordination held good in every church where he offered satisfactory evidence of his status. So great indeed was the disapproval in early times of anything that looked like the abandonment by clerics of the church for which they were originally ordained—witness the 15th canon of the council of Nicaea, and the 2nd canon of the first council of Arles—that it was not often the case that the presbyter or deacon of one church is found ministering in another. Still cases did occur, and with increasing frequency as time went on: St. Cyprian for instance (*Ep.* xl.) attached the presbyter and confessor Numidicus to the body of the Carthaginian clergy (though it is obvious that he writes as if it were an unusual course to take, and one requiring special reasons), and his language quite excludes any idea of reordination. As we get to the end of the third and into the fourth century, the principle that a man is a presbyter or deacon not of one church only but of the whole Church comes to be more frequently stated or implied. In the 'Canons of Hippolytus'[1] this is laid down for presbyters: and,

[1] C. ix: 'Let him not be ordained again.' The *Apostolic Canons* (68) condemn to deposition any cleric who receives a second ordination, both him and his ordainer, 'unless it should appear that his (first) ordination was from heretics'; the synod of Capua, A.D. 391, forbade rebaptisms, reordinations, and translation of bishops, and the canon was incorporated into the African collection (Hefele *Conciliengesch.* § 108) so Theodoret tells us that a foolish monk, who was afraid he should be ordained over again (having been ordained once without knowing it), was assured that 'it was not possible to give him twice the same ordination' (*Rel. Hist.* xiii. ap. Migne *Patrol. Graec.* lxxxii. col. 1404A); so the author of the *Quaestiones in Vet. et Nov. Test.* declares (*Qu.* ci.): 'quamquam apud . . . Deum unicuique hic honor maneat, qui decretus est singulis ecclesiarum officiis, ut qui diaconus est diaconi honorem per omnes ecclesias habeat.' When bishops are forbidden to ordain clerics who belong to other dioceses (Can. Nicaen. 16, cf. Can. Apost. 15), this of course means to a higher grade than that which they already held. Dr. Hatch's statement (*Growth*

to take a somewhat earlier instance, St. Peter is represented in the Clementines as travelling about with some attendant 'presbyters' who are clearly conceived of as being more than local officers—as being presbyters wherever they are.[1] Nor, again, when we hear of the reinstatement of clergy, originally ordained in the Church, who had been deposed, or who had lapsed into heresy or schism, do we ever hear of their reordination. It is not indeed until comparatively late that we hear of any such reinstatement: for the severe view which was taken of deadly sin in the clergy forbade that they should resume their office, just as it was forbidden to 'penitents' to be ordained at all.[2] Such lapsed or deposed clergy were treated as laymen, or, when their sin was grave, deprived

though deposed clergy were treated as laymen,

of Ch. Inst. p. 36; cf. *Dict. Chr. Ant.* ii. p. 1479) that in early days 'the transference of the officer of one Church to another . . . when allowed, involved reappointment, or, as it would now be called, reordination,' is absolutely gratuitous and unsupported by facts.

Dr. Hatch repeatedly quoted, as evidence of a double ordination, an 'important Galatian inscription of A.D. 461, which speaks of one who filled the office of presbyter *twice*' (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* No. 9259: δὶς γενόμενος πρεσβύτερος); cf. his *B. L.*[2] p. 137 n.[51]. Harnack accepted this use of the inscription, *Gesellschaftsverfassung* p. 234 n.[13], and in the earlier editions of the present work I had contented myself with pointing out that, even if Dr. Hatch's interpretation were correct, tombstone theology all the world over is lax and uncertain, but that the inscription itself did not at all seem to support the sense that Dr. Hatch put on it. A certain Tarasis there buried is described as δὶς γενομενος πρεσβ[ὺ] και παραμοναριος παροικησας εν τω τοπω τουτω. Ὁ παραμονάριος (or προσμονάριος) is the Latin *mansionarius*. He is a 'residentiary' in charge of any institution belonging to the Church. This Tarasis was twice appointed 'presbyter and residentiary'—of a particular church or monastery. There is nothing here to suggest that he was twice ordained in the fifth century. A similar expression (referring, I think, to one man) occurs twice in an *Ordo Romanus* ap. Hittorp. pp. 1, 10: 'presbytero et mansionario.'

But in fact it appeared that we were all in the dark, and that skilled epigraphists had no doubt that Tarasis was not 'twice presbyter' but 'twice Tarasis,' i.e. 'Tarasis, son of Tarasis.' See Dr. A. C. Headlam *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Supplem. Paper 1, 'Ecclesiastical sites in Isauria,' Macmillan, 1893, pp. 24-5, who refers to Ramsay, *Oxford Mag.* vol. ix. No. 24 (1891), p. 411, and Reinach, *Epigr. Grecque*, p. 508, and remarks: 'This idiom is so common, especially in inscriptions of Asia Minor, that it is hardly necessary to give instances.'

[1] See *Clem. Hom.* vii. 12: ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπομένων αὐτῷ πρεσβυτέρων ἕνα ἐπίσκοπον αὐτοῖς καταστήσας (cf. 5, 8).

[2] 'Nullum mihi occurrit exemplum spatio trecentorum et quinquaginta annorum clerici catholici ad haereticos transfugae post reversionem ad ecclesiam cum ordinum exercitio suscepti' (Morinus *de S. Ord.* pars. iii. ex. v. 10. 2). Cf. *Apost. Can.* 62: μετανοήσας ὡς λαϊκὸς δεχθήτω, and Cyprian *Ep.* lv. 11: 'sic tamen admissus est Trofimus ut laicus communicet, non . . . quasi locum sacerdotii usurpet.' Morinus, *l.c.*, deals with some instances advanced in the opposite sense.

even of lay communion.[1] But after the middle of the fourth century we have plenty of instances in which Catholic clergy, who had become Arians, Nestorians, Pelagians, or heretics of whatever sort, were readmitted to their 'order,' always without reordination;[2] and it is noticeable that St. Basil, though holding that the clergy who fall away from the Church lose the power of administering valid sacraments, still speaks of the ordination gift as a permanent endowment.[3]

On the other hand, it is quite certain that the early Church did not draw the clear line which in the West was drawn later on between the reality of the priesthood and its regular exercise. The deposed priest was really regarded as a layman.[4] And in the same way ordinations, which later would have been regarded as uncanonical, were in early days regarded as invalid. Morinus expresses the matter admirably by saying, 'moraliter magis et civiliter de istis philosophati sunt.' They thought of ordination, that is, in connexion with all its moral and social associations, as part of the whole life of the Church; thus very naturally, 'they did not regard the validity of the ordination as lying *merely* in the character of the act, but they took into account also the authority of the Church and questions of moral expediency.'[5]

and uncanonical ordinations as invalid.

[1] E.g. Can. Sardic. 1: 'ut nec laicam habeat communionem.' Cf. Cyprian *Ep.* iii. 1: 'Evaristum de episcopo iam nec laicum remansisse.'

[2] They are 'certainly not ordained again,' St. Augustin says (*de Bapt.* i. 1. [2]); cf. Hefele *Conciliengesch.* § 142. The Council of Ephesus allowed clerical converts from the Massalian or Euchite sect to remain among the clergy on condition of anathematizing their former errors. Morinus *l.c.* §§ 7, 8 f. collects other instances. The Council of Toledo in A.D. 633 (c. 28) gives the form for the restoration to their order of some clergy who had been unjustly deposed. They are to receive their lost orders, 'gradus amissos recipere,' before the altar by a renewed *reception of the vestments or* (in the case of subdeacons) *instruments* proper to their office—'ea in reparationem sui recipiant, quae cum ordinarentur perceperant.' This is not 're-ordination' technically, as Dr. Hatch calls it (*Dict. Chr. Ant.* ii. p. 1520).

[3] *Ep.* clxxxviii. can. 1: οἱ γὰρ πρῶτοι ἀναχωρήσαντες παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἔσχον τὰς χειροτονίας καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν εἶχον τὸ χάρισμα τὸ πνευματικόν.

[4] πεπαύσθω τοῦ κλήρου is a common phrase. Cf. *Dict. Chr. Ant.* ii. p. 1520.

[5] Morinus *de S. Ord.* pars iii. ex. v. cc. 9. 8, 11. 2; cf. Bingham *Ant.* xvii. 2.

The word 'valid' meant to them what, according to more elaborated definitions, is expressed by *both valid and canonical*. How could they believe an act done in violation of the will of God to carry with it His ratification and be valid? So they reasoned, and so reasoning they pronounced invalid (ἄκυρος, unratified) an ordination of which, in the West in later days, it would only have been said: *fieri non debuit: factum valet.*[1]

Distinction between 'canonical' and 'valid' slowly recognised in the West;

The great peril, however, of making the unworthiness of the minister hinder the grace of the sacrament soon became apparent, first in connexion with baptism. Thus the council at Arles[2] decreed for the

[1] ἄκυρος ἔστω ἡ χειροθεσία, καθαιρείσθω. This is very frequent: cf. e.g. Can. Apost. 36; Antioch. 13, 22; Sardic. 15; Constantin. 4; Chalcedon. 6. A person who had thus received an 'invalid' ordination became disqualified for the canonical ministry, and the question of his reordination did not therefore often occur. But the Church, as we shall see, accepted the Donatist ordinations. And Arian ordination had been, at least in some places, accepted.

The Council of Nicaea (1) rejected the baptism of the disciples of Paul of Samosata (c. 19) on the ground, as Athanasius tells us, of their heresy—not owing to their use of a defective form (Bright, *Notes on the Canons*, p. 67). It therefore decreed also that those who had been amongst the Paulianist clergy and were yet considered fit for church orders should be first 'baptized afresh and then ordained by the bishop of the catholic Church.' The repudiation of their baptism carried with it a repudiation of their ordinations.

(2) With reference to the Novatianist clergy (οἱ καθαροί) the Council decreed ὥστε χειροθετουμένους αὐτοὺς μένειν οὕτως ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ (c. 8). It has been disputed whether this means that they should be *reordained*, or receive the imposition of hands as a ceremony of reconciliation. The former interpretation seems perhaps *of the two* the more probable; see Bright, *Notes*, p. 25 f. But it is possible that the bishops of the council did not accurately distinguish between a fresh ordination and an act of reception by the Church which gave validity to an old one. They use the words μένειν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ, and certainly the language does not suggest a new ordination, such as the Paulianists needed. So in the same way the clergy ordained by Meletius were allowed to retain their office (τιμὴν καὶ λειτουργίαν) when they had been 'confirmed by a more sacred ordination' (μυστικωτέρᾳ χειροτονίᾳ βεβαιωθέντας, ap. Soc. *H. E.* i. 9); this certainly suggests the idea of an act giving validity to an old ordination, rather than a completely new ordination. (In a similar manner the penitential laying-on of hands is regarded as a recovery of the gift of confirmation, or identified with confirmation, Mason, *Rel. of Bapt. to Conf.* pp. 67, 101, 175, 179.) Later western councils receive clergy ordained amongst the Gothic Arians by a similar laying-on of hands—'cum impositae manus benedictione' (Council of Orleans A.D. 511, c. 10), 'accepta denuo benedictione presbyteratus' (Council of Saragossa, A.D. 592, c. 1). In the context of the passage quoted above from Socrates there is a clear recognition by the historian in the case of Meletius himself of the distinction between *being a bishop* and being allowed *to act as such*. The council allowed him (he says) to retain the ἀξία τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, but took away the ἐξουσία τοῦ πράττειν αὐτόν τινα ὡς ἐπίσκοπον.

[2] c. 8 [9]: 'Si perviderint [haereticum] in Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto esse baptizatum, manus ei tantum imponatur ut accipiat Spiritum sanctum.' c. 13 [14] decided that ordinations by 'traditor' bishops were valid.

West the validity of heretical baptisms. But the rigorism, which was always ready to 'make a man an offender for a word' and then repudiate his ministry, was still felt in the case of the Luciferians and Donatists to be a real danger. Accordingly Jerome and Augustin lead the way in extending the principle of the decision at Arles, so as to admit of the recognition of ordinations made by Arians, where the person so ordained gave satisfactory evidence of his orthodoxy, or again by Donatists, if their clergy would communicate again with the Church on her terms.[1]

And this was not a mere economical arrangement in view of particular cases. It was based by St. Augustin on general principles which would apply in many directions—the principle, namely, that 'the sacrament of ordination remains in those who are ordained; and if from any fault a man be removed from his office, yet he will not be without the Lord's

[1] This is the point of Jerome's argument against Lucifer. He has a beautiful passage on the rarity of perfect faith, and the necessity therefore of recognising that *imperfect faith* is no obstacle to God's Spirit being administered; 'fides, quae etiam apud eos qui bene credunt difficile perfecta invenitur' (*adv. Lucifer.* 15). He also presses the principle involved in the recognition of heretical baptism: 'eadem ratione episcopum ab Arianis recipio qua tu recipis baptizatum' (*ib.* 14). He does not, however, commit himself as Augustin does.

Augustin carries out the argument with great vigour, using in part and developing Jerome's material, in his anti-Donatist writings. The question (he contends) what a man believes who receives or administers the sacrament of baptism is of great importance for his own salvation, but is wholly immaterial for its effect on the sacrament—'ad quaestionem sacramenti' (*de Bapt.* iii. 14 [19]). Sacraments ministered by heretics are valid, but their benefits are suspended till those who receive them come over to church unity (*de Bapt.* vii. 54 [103]; *c. Epist. Parmen.* ii. 13 [29]). This is as true of ordination as of baptism; as ordained men, if they secede and return to the Church, 'are certainly not ordained again, but either again exercise their former ministry, or if they do not exercise it at any rate *retain the sacrament of their ordination*,' so also 'we do not dare to repudiate God's sacraments even when administered in schism' (*de Bapt.* i. 1 [2]). So, with great clearness, *c. Epist. Parmen.* ii. 13 [28]: 'nulla ostenditur causa cur ille, qui ipsum baptismum amittere non potest, ius dandi possit amittere: utrumque enim sacramentum est, et quadam consecratione utrumque homini datur, illud cum baptizatur, istud cum ordinatur, ideoque in catholica utrumque non licet iterari. Nam si quando ex ipsa parte venientes etiam praepositi bono pacis, correcto schismatis errore, suscepti sunt, etiam si visum est opus esse ut eadem officia gererent quae gerebant, non sunt rursus ordinati: sed sicut baptismus in eis, ita ordinatio mansit integra: quia in praecisione fuerat vitium quod unitatis pace correctum est, non in sacramentis, quae ubicumque sunt ipsa sunt.'

sacrament once imposed, though remaining now only to condemn him';[1] and the associated principle, transferred from baptism to ordination, that schism and heresy do indeed destroy the spiritual value of sacraments, but not their reality. This latter principle was not indeed generally admitted in the East,[2] nor was it quickly worked out to its results in the West. Still it took root. Leo the Great, for example, pronounces that some uncanonically consecrated bishops are *no bishops at all*,[3] but 'pseudo-episcopi.' But then he goes on to intimate that, where their ordinations—otherwise 'vain'—were allowed by the canonical bishop, they could be accepted as 'valid,' showing clearly that, though he did not regard consecration with the proper form as absolutely valid by itself apart from canonical conditions, he yet did regard it as valid in such sense as that church recognition, subsequently given, might impart to it a retrospective validity.

only partially in the East.

In this uncertain and ambiguous position the matter long remained. 'What is it,' says Morinus, 'to track the controversy [on the validity of heretical or schismatical or simoniacal ordinations] but to exhibit bishops against bishops, councils against

[1] *de Bono Coniugali* 24 [32]: 'Quemadmodum si fiat ordinatio cleri ad plebem congregandam, etiamsi plebis congregatio non subsequatur, manet tamen in illis ordinatis sacramentum ordinationis: et si aliqua culpa quisquam ab officio removeatur, sacramento Domini semel imposito non carebit, quamvis ad iudicium permanente.'

[2] Not, e.g., by St. Basil. In *Ep.* clxxxviii. he does not admit the principle of the validity of baptism by sects who are in fundamental heresy on the doctrine of God: nor quite thoroughly as regards the Novatians and Encratites, though some of their ordinations had been allowed. He seems to regard it as a matter *depending on the Church's judgment* in any case: and so eastern writers subsequently.

[3] *Ep.* clxvii. *ad Rusticum* inq. 1: 'Nulla ratio sinit ut inter episcopos habeantur qui nec a clericis sunt electi nec a plebibus sunt expetiti nec a provincialibus episcopis cum metropolitani iudicio consecrati. Unde, cum saepe quaestio de male accepto honore nascatur, quis ambigat nequaquam istis esse tribuendum, quod non docetur fuisse collatum? Si qui autem clerici ab istis pseudoepiscopis in eis ecclesiis ordinati sunt, qui ad proprios episcopos pertinebant, et ordinatio eorum consensu et iudicio praesidentium facta est, potest rata haberi, ita ut in ipsis ecclesiis perseverent: aliter autem vana habenda est creatio, quae nec loco fundata est nec auctore munita.'

councils, pontiffs against pontiffs, waging a Cadmeian war?'[1] The Eastern Church has, in fact, never got beyond the position that the Church has the power to ratify in any particular case, or set of cases, ordinations which in the West would be called *per se* valid but uncanonical.[2]

It can hardly be a subject for regret that the Church should have exhibited considerable unwillingness in isolating the consideration of the validity of ordination from its context in the whole question of what constitutes a right relation to the Church. It cannot, however, be denied that the analogy of all sacramental grace forced the Church to distinguish between the gift that is in the man by the laying-on of hands and its reverent or obedient exercise. It must also be borne in mind, especially from the point of view of our present argument, that whatever hesitation was felt in accepting and formulating this principle was due to the high regard in which the ordination gift was held—not to any disparagement of it: so that there was at no time any hesitation in recognising the indelibility of orders, when imparted and exercised in obedience to the Church.

V. That use of sacerdotal terms implied no new idea of the ministry.

V. It will be noticed that whereas the conception of the Christian ministry and pastorate of souls dates back behind our present period into the immemorial past, it is only at the beginning of our period that the title of the Priesthood begins to be applied to it. Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria do not speak of the Christian ministers as priests, while Tertullian and Origen do, so that it is only quite at the end of

[1] *de S. Ord.* pars iii. ex. v. 8. 1. See further on the whole subject the exhaustive discussion by Saltet *Réordinations* (Paris, Lecoffre, 1907).

[2] Morinus pars iii. ex. v. 11. 4: 'His cum praecedentibus comparatis, colligitur Ecclesiam Orientalem varie pro variis temporibus haereticos admisisse. Constat enim quibusdam temporibus, praesertim nascente haeresi, ut via planior ad reditum iis sterneretur, certorum haereticorum ordinationes admisisse; aliis vero eas infirmas et irritas declarasse et iterasse.'

the second century that sacerdotal terms begin to be regularly[1] applied to the clergy.

The question arises: Does this change of language represent a change of ideas, or merely a readjustment of terms in view of changed circumstances? We cannot argue always or absolutely from a gradual change in language to a change in ideas. For instance, we have every reason for supposing that the first Christians believed in the Divine Sonship of Christ. A Christian of the first century, with the teaching of the Apostles in his mind, would, we feel no doubt, have sided unambiguously with St. Athanasius and not with Arius; and that not because Athanasius would have persuaded him to give any new honour to Christ, but because he would, when he understood the controversy, have seen what his old faith implied: that it was indeed the teaching of St. John and St. Paul about Christ that He was 'God of God, very God of very God.' But, on the other hand, this faith of the Church could not be expressed so unreservedly in the first age as in later times. 'Jesus is very God' was not the first truth to put before a Jew, but 'Jesus is the Christ'; this is the substance of the first apostolic preaching as recorded in the Acts—the Messianic authority of Christ, not His divine nature. So again 'Jesus is the Son of God' was not the first truth to preach to the heathen with their polytheism and mythology, lest they should only too easily incorporate Him into their Pantheon: the basis of monotheism must be firmly laid before the Divine Sonship of Christ can be securely preached.[2] There is then a change of terminology which means a change of circumstances

Reasons for earlier abstinence.

[1] Dr. Lightfoot, *Dissertation* p. 254, thinks Polycrates' description of St. John as 'a priest wearing the mitre—πέταλον' (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24. 3) is perhaps the first instance of sacerdotal language being applied to the Christian ministry. But we have the expression in the *Didache* xiii. 3: 'they are your high priests.' For the *Church Order* of Hippolytus see p. 133.

[2] See St. Paul's first preaching to heathen, Acts xiv. 14-17 and xvii. 22-31.

rather than of ideas. To take another instance from the records of the language of the early Church. The early apologists believed in a Christian sacrifice in the Eucharist; if the sense in which they did so may be discussed, the fact is undoubted. But Justin Martyr, who expresses his appreciation of the eucharistic sacrifice to Trypho the Jew, denies to the heathen emperor that God needs material oblations.[1] Athenagoras makes the same denial, and then puts in parenthetically—as it were under his breath—'and yet we must offer a bloodless sacrifice and bring before God the spiritual service.'[2] The Christian in fact had, or had not, a sacrifice according as the term was used in one sense or in another.

The same seems to have been true of the priesthood. 'It would only have caused confusion,' Mr. Simcox justly says,[3] 'when "a great company of the priests was obedient to the faith," to have said that St. Barnabas was a priest, when he was in fact a Levite.' The term 'priest' indeed carried with it many associations, Jewish and pagan, which did not belong to Christianity. Outside the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ is not termed a priest, and even there it is said: 'if He were on earth, He would not be a priest at all, seeing there are those who offer the gifts according to the law.'[4] So, too, it is conceivable that a Christian missionary of our own day might find it necessary, amidst the associations of a pagan priesthood, to emphasize by the avoidance of the term 'priest' the points of difference in the Christian ministry: just as it would have been wiser at times to have produced a monotheistic atmosphere as a preparation for preaching the divinity of Christ.

[1] *Dial. c. Tryph.* 117 (cf. 22); *Apol.* i. 10.

[2] *Legat.* 13: καίτοι προσφέρειν δέον ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν.

[3] *Early Church History* p. 59.

[4] Hebr. viii. 4 (R.V.).

But when once the Christian atmosphere has been cleared,—when once the unique high-priesthood of Christ is realized and the communication of that priesthood to the Church,—it becomes natural to apply the term 'priest' to the divinely ordained ministers of this priestly congregation. As this special application has been shown in the last chapter (pp. 70-80) to involve no loss of the general conception of the 'high-priestly race,' so also it carries with it no change of ideas about the ministry. The 'bishops' whom Clement of Rome describes as 'offering the gifts' in the spiritual temple of the Church, under Christ 'the high-priest of our oblations,' may as well as not be called priests. Hippolytus expresses by the term 'the high-priesthood' exactly the same idea of the episcopate as is expressed by Irenaeus without its use.[1] Ignatius, who does not call the Christian officers priests, emphasizes their authority more than Origen, who uses the term freely, and not less than Cyprian. There is an overstrained expression of sacerdotal authority in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, as well as in its source, the third-century *Didascalia*,[2] but this comes from a slight hardening of Ignatius' teaching and is in no apparent connexion with the change in terms. On the other hand, the Fathers are not, generally speaking, chargeable with a false concep-

[1] See App. Note G. It is important to notice the triple derivation of sacerdotal language. There is (1) the idea of the high-priesthood of Truth. The term high-priest is applied thus to the prophet (*Didache* xiii. 3), or to the bishop as sitting in the chair of the prophetic teacher (Hippolyt. *Ref. Omn. Haer.* prooem. [p. 348 *infra*] and the Clementines). There is (2) the idea of the high-priesthood of Sacrifice realized in the Church through the mediation of Christ. This is the idea of priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in Clement of Rome, in Justin Martyr, in Irenaeus; and the term priest came to be applied in this sense to the bishop or presbyter as to him 'who offers the gifts.' It is noticeable that the unity of prophecy and priesthood underlies the use of the sacerdotal term λειτουργεῖν τῷ Κυρίῳ of the prophets in Acts xiii. 2. There is (3) the idea of the Power of the Keys—the authority to bind and loose in the Christian society—belonging to the bishop alone, as in the *Church Order* of Hippolytus (see p. 133), or to the bishop with the presbyters, as it is emphasized in the Clementines.

[2] See passages quoted in the notes to pp. 139, 140 *supra*.

tion of the priestly office; but (as these pages will have shown) in the old offices of ordination, in the writings on the pastoral charge, and in the early canons, the idea is kept in due proportion and harmony with the whole of church life and spiritual truth. If the Church is a high-priestly race, and if in the Church there is a ministry of divine authority both in the communication of God's gifts to man and in the offering of man's gifts to God, that ministry can quite legitimately be called a priesthood.[1]

VI. The powers of the ministry 'exclusive.'

VI. We may claim now to have fairly substantiated the five fundamental positions which were propounded at the opening of this chapter. It is still however necessary, in order to make our case complete, to refer to the *exclusive* character attributed to the powers of the ministry, and attributed to them, as far as the evidence goes, from the first.

A positive claim is in a certain sense necessarily also exclusive; the position involves a negation. 'I am empowered by ordination to minister' implies that 'you who have no such ordination have no such power.' The church ministry made, then, an exclusive claim. This, of course, needs qualification; however much the office of teaching or baptizing was kept under the bishop's control and practically confined to the clergy, still lay baptism was generally regarded, at any rate from the end of the second

[1] Dr. R. C. Moberly in his *Ministerial Priesthood* (Murray, 1897) did the Church an immense service by at the same time vindicating the institution of the priestly ministry in the Church and also insisting on a right conception of it. In particular he insisted that the authority to offer the eucharistic sacrifice does not admit of being isolated from the other (pastoral) functions of the ministry, and represented as substantially constituting priesthood—as was done in the later Roman tradition—without moral or intellectual disaster. The Christian priest is the Christian pastor. And Dr. Sanday wrote with reference to the book: 'When the doctrine of a "sacrificing Priesthood" is presented in this way, I confess that I do not see why any of us should quarrel with it. I do not think that we do quarrel with it. If that sainted bishop [Lightfoot] . . . who brought out the stores of his learning to combat what is commonly known as "sacerdotalism" could arise and be questioned, and have this theory of "Ministerial Priesthood" set before him, I fully believe that he would not condemn but welcome it.'—*Conception of Priesthood* (Longmans, 1898) p. 92.

century onwards, as valid and allowable in circumstances of necessity,[1] while lay teaching also was from time to time permitted.[2] Ambrosiaster tells us that there was at first greater freedom in this respect: all used to teach and all to baptize.[3] But, though this be admitted, it is still true to say that certain functions have been regarded as confined to certain church officers, in such sense that others cannot validly perform them. Thus St. Jerome writes: 'Since Hilary has withdrawn from the Church, being nothing but a deacon—a world in himself as he imagines—he can neither consecrate a eucharist (for he has neither bishops nor presbyters) nor without a eucharist hand on baptism; and when the individual is dead, his sect is gone with him; for, as a deacon, he could ordain no clergyman after him. And that is no Church which has no priests.'[4] Again, the eighteenth canon of Nicaea distinguishes between the deacons 'who have not the authority to offer' and the presbyters who have.

This, of course, represents the common doctrine; only a priest can offer or consecrate the Eucharist, as only a bishop can ordain. But it is sometimes urged that this is a later conception in the Church:

[1] Cf. e.g. Tertull. *de Bapt.* 17; Council of Elvira, c. 38. Jerome (*adv. Lucifer.* 9) says: 'Inde venit, ut sine chrismate et episcopi iussione neque presbyter neque diaconus ius habeant baptizandi. Quod frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogit, scimus etiam licere laicis.'

[2] *Apost. Const.* viii. 32. 17: ὁ διδάσκων, εἰ καὶ λαϊκὸς εἴη, ἔμπειρος δὲ τοῦ λόγου καὶ τὸν τρόπον σεμνός, διδασκέτω: the substance of the prescription comes from the *Church Order* of Hippolytus (the Latin is here defective, but the Ethiopic runs as follows), 'after the prayer, when the teacher has laid his hand upon the catechumen, he shall pray and dismiss them; and if it was . . . a layman who teaches, he shall do likewise.' See note (31) in Migne *Patrol. Graec.* i. col. 1132.

[3] See the passage quoted in Note F, p. 335.

[4] Jerome *adv. Lucif.* 21. 'He cannot without a eucharist hand on baptism,' because 'baptism' is used to include confirmation, and the chrism for confirmation was consecrated by the bishop in the course of the eucharistic service. So St. Cyprian specially connects the chrism with the eucharist and the altar, *Ep.* lxx. 2: 'Ungi quoque necesse est eum qui baptizatus est, ut accepto chrismate id est unctione esse unctus Dei et habere in se gratiam Christi possit. Porro autem eucharistia est unde baptizati unguuntur oleum in altari sanctificatum. Sanctificare autem non potuit olei creaturam qui nec altare habuit nec ecclesiam.' See on both passages Mason *Relation of Confirmation to Baptism* pp. 68, 168.

earlier, as in Ignatius and Clement, you have the conception of the authority of the ministry strongly developed, but without this 'sacerdotal exclusiveness.' 'Let that be esteemed a valid Eucharist,' Ignatius says, 'which is celebrated *under the bishop or his delegate*; . . . it is not lawful, apart from the bishop, to baptize or celebrate a love-feast': [1] but here, it is urged, the idea is simply that a sacrament must be *duly authorized*; and this would be quite compatible with the validity of a lay Eucharist, if only the layman had authority given him to celebrate it. It was a question of order—not of exclusive grace.

The rights of the ministry a matter of order,

Now it is perfectly true that in the first age the dominant idea was that of Church order.[2] The priesthood was not, as much as in later days, regarded as an endowment of the individual. There was not the same distinction drawn between what was valid and what was canonical. On this point enough has already been said. But it is obvious that the conception of church order is capable of embracing what is included in both the terms 'canonical' and 'valid.' Thus the language of Ignatius about the Eucharist is capable of covering the position that only a presbyter can have the bishop's licence to consecrate, even if it also covers the position that a presbyter's celebration, *apart from episcopal authority*, would lack validity. And we certainly find that Clement assigns the 'offering of the gifts' to the episcopal (or presbyteral) office, and speaks of each order as having its own limited functions in the celebration of the Eucharist by divine appointment.[3]

but also of special 'charisma.'

[1] *ad Smyrn.* 8; see, however, further, in chap. vi. pp. 258-271, for Ignatius' whole conception.

[2] Cf. Tertull. *de Bapt.* 17: 'Dandi quidem [baptismum] habet ius summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus: dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiae honorem, quo salvo salva pax est.' Cf. Jerome, in note [2] on p. 159: and [Ambrose] *de Sacramentis* iii. 1. 4: 'exordium ministerii a summo est sacerdote.'

[3] *ad. Cor.* 41; ἕκαστος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι εὐχαριστείτω θεῷ ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων, μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὡρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα, ἐν σεμνότητι. But see further in chap. vi. pp. 279, 283.

Again, when we go further back, we find in the Acts the idea of exclusive function: for, though nothing is said about the Eucharist in particular, only the apostle, or perhaps also the prophet, can lay on hands to give the gift of the Holy Ghost. And so, in special connexion with ordination, St. Paul speaks of Timothy as empowered by a gift of grace given to him as an individual by the laying-on of hands, and presumably conveyed by him to those on whom he is directed to lay hands after the apostolic pattern. It does not in the least follow that, because Ignatius and Clement press the idea of divine order, they ignore the reality of ordination grace, which as positive is also exclusive. It is, of course, a fact that there is much more early evidence for the general position that no ministry was acknowledged in the Church which was not performed in accordance with church order, and for the principle of special positive powers conveyed to individuals by ordination, than there is for the particular limitation to presbyters of the celebration of the Eucharist: but it is a false supposition (considering the traditional character of the Church) that an institution or limitation only began to exist when we happen first to hear of it.[1]

Have we, then, any reason to believe that a layman would in any age have been allowed to celebrate the Eucharist even in case of necessity?[2]

[1] 'It is certainly a mistake to suppose that an institution in the Church had its earliest origin at that period when first we come to hear of it. Many errors in investigations in the department of Church history arise from identifying the time of the origin of an institution with the time at which we happen to come across it': Harnack in *Expositor*, May 1887, p. 321. It must have been a surprise to many people to find in the *Didache* the observance of the Wednesday and Friday fasts and of trine affusion.

[2] When Clement of Alexandria says of the Christian: ἐσπέρας δὲ ἀναπαύσασθαι καθήκει μετὰ τὴν ἑστίασιν καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀπολαύσεσιν εὐχαριστίαν (*Paed.* ii. 10. 96), he is referring to the 'grace' for the supper. Εὐχαριστεῖν long continued to be used for 'saying grace' in the church of Alexandria: cf. pseudo-Athan. *de Virgin.* 12: ἐσθιε τὸν ἄρτον σου εὐχαριστήσασα τῷ θεῷ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης σου (and so three times in c. 13). Dr. Bigg's suggestion of a domestic 'Eucharist' with only the head of the house to celebrate it (*B. L.* p. 103 n.[2] [ed. 2, p. 138 n.[1]]) seems, therefore gratuitous, and is not borne out by the words of Clement.

Tertullian's view to the contrary

Yes, it is at once answered: Tertullian says so. It is in a Montanist treatise, where he is arguing, in the severe spirit of that body, against the lawfulness of second marriages. His opponent is supposed to urge that they are forbidden only to priests.

'Vain,' replies Tertullian, 'shall we be if we think that what is not lawful for priests is lawful for laics. Are not even we laics priests? (Rev. i. 6 quoted.) It is the authority of the Church which makes a difference between the order and the people. . . . Thus, where there is no bench of clergy, you *offer* and baptize and are priest alone for yourself. Nay, where three are, there is a Church, although they be laics. . . . Therefore, if you have the rights of a priest in your person when it is necessary, it behoves you to have likewise the discipline of a priest when it is necessary to use his right. If you are a digamist, can you baptize? can you offer? How much more capital a crime is it for the digamist laic to act for the priest, when the priest himself, if he turn digamist, is deprived of the power of acting as priest?'[1]

Tertullian is here confessedly speaking about abnormal cases, and in this same treatise he speaks of a man offering the eucharist under usual circumstances for his wife or wives departed by the hands of the priest—*per sacerdotem*.[2] He is in fact enunciating here the principle which seems to him to be involved in the right, admitted by himself and his contemporaries, of a layman in extreme cases—though only in extreme cases—to baptize. It was common ground, then and for long afterwards, that the bishop's authority was normally necessary for the ministration of all sacraments, even that of baptism:

[1] *de Exhort. Cast.* 7: 'Vani erimus, si putaverimus quod sacerdotibus non liceat laicis licere. Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est: Regnum quoque nos et sacerdotes Deo et Patri suo fecit. Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus. Adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers et tinguis et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici. Unusquisque enim sua fide vivit, nec est personarum acceptio apud Deum: quoniam non auditores legis justificabuntur a Domino, sed factores, secundum quod et apostolus dicit. Igitur si habes ius sacerdotis in temetipso ubi necesse est, habeas oportet etiam disciplinam sacerdotis, ubi necesse sit habere ius sacerdotis. Digamus tinguis? digamus offers? quanto magis laico digamo capitale est agere pro sacerdote. cum ipsi sacerdoti digamo auferatur agere sacerdotem?'

[2] *ib.* 11: 'Offeres pro duabus et commendabis illas duas *per sacerdotem* de monogamia ordinatum?'

where the bishop did not baptize himself, he commissioned individual members of his clergy to act for him. On what basis of principle, then, was lay baptism defensible? Tertullian answers, on the principle of the inherent priesthood of all the Christian faithful, which, in case of real necessity, supersedes the limitations imposed by the differentiation of functions within the Church, and enables a layman to do what, normally and properly, only the official priesthood could do. And in theory, he would say, this is as true of the eucharist as of baptism. But in practice of course cases of real necessity might and did arise in respect of the one sacrament, while they could hardly arise in respect of the other. We are not to suppose, therefore, that Tertullian, even as a Montanist, contemplated the actual offering of the eucharist by a layman.[1]

At the same time there is no doubt about his theoretical claim; and if this passage could be fairly quoted as evidence of the mind of the Church at the time, it would go at least to show that, while the right of the layman to baptize, in cases of necessity, was rather grudgingly conceded, there was no sharp line yet drawn in respect of his powers between baptism and the eucharist. But though we grant this, it is, on the other hand, certainly not the case that this passage can be fairly quoted as illustrating the mind of the Church at all. Tertullian, in fact, is writing as a Montanist;[2] that is, as one of a body

follows from his Montanist position.

[1] It needs to be remembered that, on all showing, a private Christian of Tertullian's day could *receive the sacrament* at home, *Ad uxorem* ii. 5. Thus he could 'play the priest for himself,' at least by giving himself the sacrament. It is not impossible that Tertullian has nothing more than this behind his argument. As indeed such a custom seems to remove all excuse for any further concession to the laity.

[2] There is no doubt about this, for a prophecy of Prisca is quoted (*de Exh. Cast.* 10): 'Item per sanctam prophetidem Priscam ita evangelizatur, quod sanctus minister sanctimoniam noverit ministrare. Purificantia enim concordat, ait, et visiones vident et ponentes faciem deorsum etiam voces audiunt manifestas, tam salutares quam et occultas.' There can be little doubt that these words belong to the true text (so Bonwetsch *Montanismus* p. 198).

which was setting itself against the Church, as in other respects, so also in reference to the authority of the episcopal ministry.[1] He had himself, before he became a Montanist, adopted a different tone. He had made carelessness about sacerdotal distinctions the very characteristic of heretical bodies.

'Their ordinations are heedless, capricious, changeable. At one time they put novices in office; at another, men involved in secular employment; at another, men who have apostatized from us. . . . And so it comes about that one man is a bishop with them to-day, another to-morrow; to-day a man is a deacon, and to-morrow a reader; to-day a presbyter, and to-morrow a layman; for they *impose even on laymen the functions of the priesthood*.'[2]

The *tone* here is undoubtedly different. Again, in another treatise, he makes it part of the unwritten but authoritative tradition of the Church, that only the 'presidents'—that is, at most the bishop and presbyters—should administer the eucharist.[3] The statement, then, that Tertullian makes as to the power of the layman 'to offer,' in cases of necessity, can no more be admitted as evidence of what the Church would have granted, than similar appeals made by Waldensians or Wesleyans of later days.

[1] Tertullian speaks of course as if his opponent would grant his position: he assumes that no logical distinction can be drawn between the theoretical right of the layman in the two cases. But Tertullian, though he is a very powerful, is not a fair arguer, and it cannot be in the least concluded that, when Tertullian uses or implies a 'Nonne,' his opponent would have answered 'Yes.'

[2] *de Praescr.* 41. For the Latin, see p. 108 n.[2].

[3] *de Corona* 3, 4: 'Eucharistiae sacramentum, et in tempore victus et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam antelucanis coetibus nec de aliorum manu quam praesidentium sumimus.' He then proceeds to argue on the authority of the Church traditions, and on their claim to obedience; 'harum et aliarum eiusmodi disciplinarum si legem expostules scripturarum, nullam invenies: traditio tibi praetendetur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix, et fides observatrix. Rationem traditioni et consuetudini et fidei patrocinaturam aut ipse perspicies aut ab aliquo qui perspexerit disces: interim nonnullam esse credes, cui debeatur obsequium.' Thus he makes this limitation of the distribution of the eucharistic sacrament to the clergy one of many immemorial traditions of the Church; and he speaks of the authoritativeness of church customs in a tone so different to what is to be quoted (p. 193 n. [2]) from the *de Virginibus Velandis* that, though the *de Corona* has some of the Montanist rigorism about it and dates not before the end of the second century, it cannot belong to his latest and most Montanist period. The nearly contemporary *Church Order* of Hippolytus expressly excludes the layman from making the benediction even over the love-feast, 'laicus benedictionem facere non potest.'

Characteristics of western Montanism:

It is, however, necessary to explain a little more fully the position of the Montanists, and that especially in order to refute the notion that, in their claim to dispense with the church ministry, they represented in any way an older and fast vanishing 'freedom of the spirit.' [1]

(1) rigorism

Montanism, then, as represented by Tertullian, had two chief characteristics. First, it was a movement characterized by an intense ascetic rigorism. Tertullian, who had deplored, but not corrected, his own impatience—that is what gives such pathos to his treatise *de Patientia*—was drawn into its ranks, as men of impatient, undisciplined zeal have been drawn in every age into puritan parties or sects. In this spirit, it was opposed to the laxer or more merciful tendencies of the authorities of the Roman Church of that day.[2] 'I hear,' says Tertullian with bitter scorn,[3] 'that an edict has been issued, and that a peremptory one. That "pontifex maximus," that bishop of bishops,[4] decrees: I forgive the sins of adultery and fornication to those who have performed penance.' This readiness to grant absolution for even the worst sins the Montanists intensely resented. Further, the Montanist discipline involved special fasts and special restrictions on marriage and other ascetic rules—for laity, no less than for clergy—which find in Tertullian a vigorous advocate, and

[1] 'The fact of the existence of Montanism,' Dr. Hatch says (*B. L.*[2] p. 125), 'strongly confirms the general inferences which are drawn from other evidence, that Church officers were originally regarded as existing for the good government of the community and for the general management of its affairs . . . that the functions which the officers performed were such as, apart from the question of order, might be performed by any member of the community.' On the Montanist movement generally, see App. Note H.: the treatment in the text is confined to the single issue whether or no Montanism in the sphere of church organization stood for a traditional liberty or no.

[2] The view of the policy of the Roman Church which Mr. Pater gives in *Marius the Epicurean* is so far justified by the number of reactionary movements which history connects with the names of Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Novatian.

[3] *de Pudic.* 1.

[4] The first title no doubt implies the paganism of the proceedings, and the second their arbitrariness, in Tertullian's judgment.

which enable him to heap contempt on the more ordinary standards of living which were reckoned sufficient among churchmen or 'natural men,' as the Montanists called them.

(2) belief in the 'new prophets'

The second characteristic of western Montanism, which it had derived from its Phrygian parentage, was a belief in the 'new prophets.' There had been in the persons of the first Montanist prophets a new outpouring of the prophetic spirit. They had been the subjects of a new and absolute inspiration; and still (though they were gone) the Montanist society had brethren with 'the gift of revelations,' who saw visions and had access to divine truth denied to common men. Men who believe themselves inspired naturally tend to despise mere church officers who make no such claim. And, besides, the church officers in the East first, and later in the West, had judged and repudiated this claim to inspiration. The Church of the 'natural men' had, according to the Montanists, rejected the Spirit.[1] It will not therefore at all surprise us that the Montanists should have regarded their inspired prophets as organs of spiritual power, in the possession of whom they were enabled to despise the bishops with their official claims. The Church never expressed any opinion on the rights which could be recognised in genuine prophets, but she denied that these men were prophets of God at all. Hence the tone of antagonism. Tertullian is still speaking of the episcopal edict. 'You say,' he argues,[2] 'that the Church has the power of forgiving sins. This truth I, more than you, at once acknowledge and set in its right relation—I, who have the Paraclete Himself in the person of the new prophets saying "the Church can forgive the sin,

and consequent disparagement of the regular ministry.

[1] See Tertull. *adv. Prax.* 1 and App. Note H, p. 350.

[2] *de Pudic.* 21: 'Sed habet, inquis, potestatem ecclesia delicta donandi. Hoc ego magis et agnosco et dispono, qui ipsum Paracletum in prophetis novis habeo dicentem: Potest ecclesia donare delictum, sed non faciam, ne et alia delinquant.'

but I will not do it lest they commit others withal."' The claim to the power of absolution in the Church was based on our Lord's promise to St. Peter, and Tertullian proceeds to examine the promise and declares that it was given to St. Peter only as an individual. The promised power, therefore, of binding and loosing has nothing to do with those who claim to inherit it.

'Now, then, what has this power to do with the Church, with your Church forsooth, mere natural man? For, in accordance with the person of Peter, it is to *spiritual* men that this power will belong,—either to an apostle, or else to a prophet. For the Church is properly and principally the Spirit Himself, in whom is the Trinity of the One Godhead—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Spirit combines that Church which the Lord made to consist in three persons. And thus, from that time forward, any number of persons, who may have combined together on this faith, is accounted "a Church" from the author and consecrator of the Church. And, accordingly, the Church, it is true, will forgive sins; but it will be the Church of the Spirit by means of the spiritual man; not the Church which consists of a number of bishops.'[1]

It will now be seen that Tertullian's argument about three constituting a Church, in the passage which came first under discussion (p. 186), is in direct connexion with the argument of this last passage. The 'anti-sacerdotal' tone of it is quite manifest—or rather, what is manifest is that it substitutes a priesthood of supposed inspiration for the priesthood of an ordained and official ministry. It sets the Church of the Spirit against the Church of the bishops.

So far, then, Montanism gives us good evidence as to the temper of the Church when she rejected that movement in the second century. But is it, then, the case that Montanism represented the older

Montanism in discipline emphatically not conservative.

[1] *ib.* 'Quid nunc et ad ecclesiam, et quidem tuam, psychice? Secundum enim Petri personam spiritalibus potestas ista conveniet, aut apostolo aut prophetae. Nam et ipsa ecclesia proprie et principaliter ipse est Spiritus, in quo est trinitas unius divinitatis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. Illam ecclesiam congregat, quam Dominus in tribus posuit. Atque ita exinde etiam numerus omnis, qui in hanc fidem conspiraverint, ecclesia ab auctore et consecratore censetur. Et ideo ecclesia quidem delicta donabit: sed ecclesia Spiritus per spiritalem hominem, non ecclesia numerus episcoporum.'

mind of the Church—an older 'freedom of prophesying'?[1] Not in the least. The Church never in fact committed herself at all to any position with reference to the rights and powers which would be allowed to those whose real inspiration she could recognise. She did not admit Montanist inspiration and then deny that it had accompanying rights; she simply denied that it was inspiration. Towards prophecy she was taking up no new line whatever. And the more closely we look at Montanism, whether in its origin or in its development, the less inclined shall we be to attribute to Montanism conservative or retrospective tendencies. 'It was the element of conservatism in it,' it has been said by one whose justice always commends his words, 'the fact that it spoke the language and reaffirmed the ideas of a bygone day, that gave Montanism its strength, and won over to it so powerful a champion as Tertullian.'[2] Such language, however, seems contrary to the evidence we have of the nature of Montanism. If we read Tertullian's *de Virginibus Velandis*, we shall be struck with its *un*conservative tone. Tertullian, the catholic, strikes the note of conservatism in the *Praescriptio*. As a Montanist he still kept his hold on the ancient doctrine; but '*novitas*' is his watchword in matters of discipline. In this region he

[1] We have not, it must be remembered, to deal in Montanism with a claim for 'liberty of prophesying' in any modern sense, but with a claim of supernatural inspiration. See Dr. Salmon's article in the *Dict. Chr. Biog.* s.v. MONTANUS; and *Authority and Archaeology* pp. 392 ff.

[2] Dr. Sanday in *Expositor*, Feb. 1887, p. 110. Bonwetsch, the best recent investigator of the matter, though he does not altogether accept this view of Montanism as a conservative or reactionary movement, quotes some words from the acts of a bishop Achatius in the Decian persecution (Ruinart *Acta Martyrum Sincera*: § 4) as a sign that this view of them was held already in early days (*Zeitschr. f.k. Wissenschaft u. k. Leben*, 1884, heft ix. p. 473). The words are: 'Cataphryges aspice, homines religionis antiquae.' But even if the reading is correct, the words certainly do not bear any meaning of that sort. They are put in the mouth of the *pagan* magistrate. He had first induced the Montanists to apostatize and sacrifice, and then held them up as examples of *return to the ancient religion, i.e. the old Roman religion*: 'ad mea sacra conversos,' he continues, 'reliquisse quae fuerant, et nobiscum diis vota persolvere.'

denounces custom: 'custom, which, taking its origin from ignorance or simplicity, is *strengthened by succession into a practice*, and then makes its position good against the truth. . . . It is not the charge of novelty, but the truth, which refutes heresies. Whatever is against the truth, this is heresy, even though it be an old custom.' The rule of faith indeed is immovable,[1] but 'the other matters of discipline and life admit the novelty of correction, because the grace of God works and advances even till the end.' There is a gradual development, then, in the Church as the Spirit—'the Lord's Vicar'—gradually works out His plan of discipline. This development has for its content 'the direction of discipline, the revelation of Scriptures, the improvement of our understanding, the advance to a better state of things.' It is like the natural development of physical life. The infancy of mankind was under the Law and the Prophets; it came to its hot youth under the Gospel; now, through the Spirit (i.e. the Spirit which inspired the new prophets, the Montanist Spirit, in virtue of which they set the 'Church of the Spirit' against the 'Church of the bishops') it is realizing the strength of manhood.'[2] This passage has no direct bearing on the claim to possess a substitute for ordained bishops in inspired prophets, but it disposes of the contention that Montanism represented conservative tendencies in matters of church

[1] But even that is more fully unfolded to Montanists: see *adv. Prax.* 2. 30, *de Res. Carn.* 63.

[2] *de Virg. Vel.* 1: 'Hac lege fidei manente, cetera iam disciplinae et conversationis admittunt novitatem correctionis, operante scilicet et proficiente usque in finem gratia Dei. . . . cum propterea Paracletum miserit Dominus ut, quoniam humana mediocritas omnia semel capere non poterat, paulatim dirigeretur et ordinaretur et ad perfectum perduceretur disciplina ab illo vicario Domini Spiritu sancto. . . . Quae est ergo Paracleti administratio, nisi haec, quod disciplina dirigitur, quod scripturae revelantur, quod intellectus reformatur, quod ad meliora proficitur? Nihil sine aetate est, omnia tempus exspectant. . . . Sic et iustitia (nam idem Deus iustitiae et creaturae) primo fuit in rudimentis, natura Deum metuens; dehinc per legem et prophetas promovit in infantiam; dehinc per evangelium efferbuit in uventutem: nunc per Paracletum componitur in maturitatem.'

discipline. As well, then, might one quote the contemporary humanitarians as illustrating what had hitherto been the Church's doctrine about Christ, as the Montanists to illustrate her doctrine of orders.[1]

Summary. Now we have come to the end of a long argument. Starting from the age of Irenaeus, we have traced downward the stream of church life, and everywhere we have found the Church recognising the authority of a ministry, derived by succession from the Apostles, and consisting of bishops, presbyters, and deacons; everywhere we have seen reason to believe that these ministers were qualified for their high functions by an ordination given after due election with the laying-on of the hands of the bishops who were before them, and only in virtue of such ordination held to possess the authority and the grace of God requisite for the ministry they were called to fulfil. It was of course only gradually that this ministerial principle gained complete and adequate expression. It was with this as with church doctrine. In both departments there is a development in explicitness of conception and in accuracy and fulness of language. But the principle held the ground from the first with thorough recognition; and the evidence of this is that, wherever the claim of the ministry was challenged, the spirit of the Church rose to maintain it, and those who could not recognise the authority of their fathers in Christ found themselves aliens from the brotherhood. The challenge may have come from the side of Montanist enthusiasm or Novatianist separatism; or it may have been due to the self-assertion of an individual against church order; or it may have had its origin in a collapse of discipline such as led to the attempt of

[1] These humanitarians really did make the claim to be the true conservatives; see Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28. 2-4. The writer from whom Eusebius is quoting (Hippolytus?) makes the suggestive rejoinder: 'What they said might have been perhaps convincing, if, first of all, the Holy Scriptures had not contradicted them.'

some deacons, in days of persecution, to offer the eucharist; or it may have been a challenge in theory rather than in practice, like Aerius' denial of the distinctive dignity of the episcopate. But in whatever sense, and from whatever quarter, the authority of the ministry was challenged, the mind of the Church spoke out loud in its vindication. For the ministry was acknowledged, instinctively and universally, as the divinely given stewardship of truth and grace, as part of the new creation of God; and, 'the things which the Lord instituted through His Apostles, these,' in Athanasius' words, 'remain honourable and valid.' As an institution of Christ through His Apostles—divine, permanent, and necessary—the threefold ministry made its appearance on the horizon of our epoch and 'the memory of man ran not to the contrary.'

CHAPTER IV

THE INSTITUTION OF THE APOSTOLATE

The present position of the argument.

HITHERTO we have been occupied in expounding a certain set of principles which are involved in the phrase 'the apostolic succession of the ministry,' and in adducing a great body of evidence calculated to show how completely, and indeed without fundamental exception, these principles obtained acceptance in the Church, and governed her action, from the middle of the second century onwards. It is, in fact, impossible to exaggerate the intimacy with which the episcopal succession is bound up with the fixed canon of Scripture and the permanent and stable creed to constitute what can rightly be called 'historical Christianity.' We may indeed see more clearly, on reviewing the earlier period, that there was the same tentativeness in the process by which the formulated nomenclature and the exact form of the ministry was arrived at, as appears in the corresponding formulation of the creed of the Church; but in neither case did this development in language and form involve any uncertainty of principle during the period so far reviewed: and if we compare the development of the ministry with the process by which the canon of Scripture was fixed, we are struck with the fact that the hesitation which appears in the latter process, as to what did and what did not fall within the canon, has no parallel in any hesitation as to what did or what did not constitute at any particular

moment the ministry in the Church. On this subject there was no conflict or division of opinion inside the body of the Church to be brought under our notice. The discussion about Montanism was not (as we have seen) a discussion as to the rights of prophets, but as to whether certain people were or were not justified in claiming the prophetic inspiration.

Hitherto, however, we have not touched the period which lies behind the middle of the second century. The reason for this has been that we have such very fragmentary light on the space which intervenes between this date and the point where the Acts of the Apostles comes to an end. 'I have elsewhere,' says Dr. Salmon, 'described the paucity of documents dating from the age immediately succeeding the apostolic, by saying that Church history passes through a tunnel. We have good light where we have the books of the New Testament to guide us, and good light again when we come down to the abundant literary remains of the latter part of the second century; but there is an intervening period, here and there faintly illumined by a few documents giving such scanty and interrupted light as may be afforded by the air-holes of a tunnel. If in our study of this dimly-lighted portion of the history we wish to distinguish what is certain from what is doubtful, we may expect to find the things certain in what can be seen from either of the two well-lighted ends. If the same thing is visible on looking from either end, we can have no doubt of its existence.'[1]

It remains to verify the postulates of Church history,

We proceed, then, to examine the beginnings of the ministry—in other words, *first*, to obtain an answer to the question whether the postulates of the later Church are verified by the intention of Jesus Christ as recorded in the Gospels (Chapter IV.): *secondly*, to interrogate the history of the apostolic

[1] *Expositor*, July 1887, p. 3 f.

Church as recorded in the Epistles and in the Acts of the Apostles, and draw out the witness which this record affords on the earliest development of the Christian ministry (Chapter V.): *lastly*, to scrutinize the documents which shed a certain amount of light on the subapostolic period, and see whether they bear out the theory of the apostolic succession, and whether, further, they supply the links which enable us to form an adequate idea of the method by which the ministry of the apostolic days passed into the ministry of the better known period of church history (Chapter VI.).[1]

first, in the light of Christ's intention.

The first task before us is to investigate the intention of Christ. It has been already pointed out that the method of Christ was to withdraw from the many upon the few. While He healed widely and freely all who had 'faith to be healed,' He taught those only, except by the way, in whom He discerned the higher sort of faith which would make them disciples. These He trained to become a firm consolidated body, rooted and grounded in faith in Himself, that they might be the nucleus of His universal Church. Even within the body of these disciples there were inner and outer circles: there were the twelve, and also 'they that were with them,'[2] the women who ministered to them, and the seventy who shared at a certain stage the apostolic commission.[3] Confining our attention now

[1] Speaking of *The Church and the Ministry*, a pamphlet in review of his Bampton Lectures, Dr. Hatch says of the author: 'He begins by asserting that he accepts the author's method, and that he wishes only to answer the question which the author proposed, viz. What does the existing evidence teach as to the early history of ecclesiastical organization? but he silently, and perhaps unconsciously, devotes the rest of his Review to the consideration of a very different question, viz. How far can the existing evidence be interpreted on the Augustinian theory?' (*B. L.* pref. to 2nd ed. p. xiii.) My contention is that the evidence at certain periods teaches positively, that is to say, the evidence collected in the last chapter and portions of the evidence now to be produced; but in the subapostolic period it is often necessary, on account of the deficiency of positive evidence, to be content with finding that what there is is consistent with the positive position which the earlier and later evidence so strongly suggests as almost to force it upon us.

[2] St. Luke xxiv. 33; cf. St. Mark iv. 10: οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα.

[3] The seventy or seventy-two (the variation of reading is discussed on p. 112 n.[1]) of St. Luke x. 1 share the earliest apostolic commission: they are sent forth (St. Luke x. 3: ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς, cf. ix. 2), with authority over the powers of Satan

to the inner circle, with whom Christ chiefly concerned Himself, we ask ourselves: Was His training of the twelve the training merely of typical disciples? or was it over and above this, the training of ministers, of officers in His kingdom? This latter seems undoubtedly the true answer. 'He called unto Him whom He Himself would, . . . and He appointed twelve that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach and to have authority to cast out devils.' 'He called His disciples and He chose from them twelve, whom also He named apostles.'[1] These, as appears from His instructions to them, are to be His authorized representatives in the ministry of mercy and judgment.[2] 'Evidently,' says Mr. Maurice, 'He never separates the thought of training them in their office from that of performing

The Gospels suggest the institution of an official apostolate,

(x. 17, 19, cf. ix. 1), as representatives of the kingdom, endowed with its peace and having power to communicate it (x. 9, cf. ix. 2, and observe x. 6: ἐπαναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν· εἰ δὲ μήγε, ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀνακάμψει), and as representatives of Christ (x. 16: ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει κ.τ.λ.). The number seventy or seventy-two is supposed to have reference to the seventy-two heads of the Sanhedrin; or to the seventy-two tribes of mankind (see Godet *in loc.* and Hippolytus *Chronicle* and *Ref. Omn. Haer.* x. 30, also *Clem. Recog.* ii. 42); or, if the reading 'seventy' is correct, much more naturally to the seventy elders endued with the spirit of prophecy (Numb. xi. 16-30). The relation of these seventy elders to Moses is used in the pseudo-Clementine *Ep. Petri* §§ 1, 3, as a model of the relation of Peter and James to the disciples who were to come after them.

Early Christian writings normally regard the 'seventy' of St. Luke x. 1 as in some sense apostles. So the Syriac *Teaching of the Apostles* reckons seventy-two apostles as originating 'the ordination to the priesthood'; a late Arab writer (in Malan *Original Documents of the Coptic Church* iii. p. 23), who may draw on earlier tradition, speaks of 'seventy other apostles'; and the 'seventy,' whom the council of Neocaesarea can. 13 [14] makes the type of the chorepiscopi are, in spite of an early Latin version which inserts the gloss 'seniorum,' certainly the 'seventy' of the New Testament. So too Jerome, *Ep.* lxxxviii. *ad Fabiol.* mans. 6, interprets the twelve springs and seventy palm-trees of Elim as symbolizing the Twelve Apostles and 'seventy disciples of second rank' in the Gospels, and the 'Twelve' and 'all the apostles' of 1 Cor. xv. 5, 7. This suggests the 'apostles' and 'prophets' of the *Didache*. It is important that those who accept the historical character of St. Luke's Gospel should recollect that there must have been in the apostolic Church a number of these 'evangelists,' who had received our Lord's commission, and whom we certainly cannot identify with presbyters whose office was local.

[1] St. Mark iii. 13-15; St. Luke vi. 13.

[2] The personal and official position of the twelve appears clearly in St. Matt. x., St. John vi. 67-70, St. Luke xxii. 29, 30; cf. St. Matt. iv. 19. They are called 'the disciples' *par excellence* (in e.g. St. Mark x. 23-46, St. John xviii. 1); so they mediated between Christ and the crowd in the feeding of the five thousand (St. Luke ix. 10-17, St. Matt. xv. 32-39) and at other times (St. John xii. 20-22); while for their position after the resurrection cf. St. Luke xxiv. 9, 33.

His own. As evidently He is training them to an *office*; He is not teaching them to be great saints, to keep up a high tone of personal holiness as if that were the end of their lives.' Thus, he adds, 'if we called the four Gospels "The Institution of a Christian Ministry," we might not go very far wrong, or lose sight of many of their essential qualities.'[1] Further, this apostolic ministry which Christ is seen to be training, though at times it seems to constitute almost the whole of that definite body which is being prepared to be the Church, is intended to be—what in history it became—not the whole Church, but only one element in it.[2] This is implied in a striking manner—and there is no doubt that what a teacher implies often produces as striking an effect upon the mind as what he explicitly teaches—in the parable in which Christ gives St. Peter a picture of the divine household which He is intending to establish. He had been uttering some warnings and encouragements to His disciples, partly in the form of parables, with reference to the spirit of detachment and its reward, and St. Peter questions Him whether He is speaking to them, the twelve, only or to all. Christ answers with another question: 'Who is that faithful and wise steward whom his Lord shall set over his household of servants, to give them their portion of meat in due season? Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find

as one element in the Church.

[1] *Kingdom of Christ*[3] ii. p. 118. On the view of the apostolate propounded by Dr. Hort in his *Christian Ecclesia* (published in 1897) see App. Note M.

[2] Such a passage as St. Matt. xxiii. 8, referred to by Dr. Hatch *B. L.*[3] p. 121, does not imply that our Lord condemned all grades and distinctions in His Church, any more than it implies a condemnation of all grades and distinctions in the State, or than St. Luke xiv. 26 implies a condemnation of all human affections, or St. Luke vi. 20, 24 of all wealth, or St. John x. 8 of all the O. T. prophets. In all these passages there is a mode of speech, which Christ often used, and of which we have to take account. He condemns all dignities which interfere with His unique mastership, not such as represent it, whether in Church or State; all wealth held as a possession or right instead of as a trust, not all wealth absolutely; all love which interferes with His divine jealousy, not domestic love in its right place; precursors who came with His claim, not those who came as His heralds.

so doing.'[1] Here is a picture of 'the household' of the Church which Christ is intending to organize, and it is represented with a permanent distinction, enduring till the Lord come again,—the distinction between the ordinary servants and the steward who distributes the 'bread of life.' Thus the impression is left on us that in the Christian household there is to be, by distinction from the ordinary members, a stewardship instituted by the Master and enduring till the end.[2]

This impression is confirmed by

This impression, derived from a general consideration of Christ's dealings with His Apostles, is deepened by the study of special commissions given to them.

(1) the commission to St. Peter,

(1) We have the commission promised to St. Peter.[3] Christ meets St. Peter's confession of His Messiahship or Divine Sonship with a special benediction. He pronounces him 'Peter,' the man of rock, and declares that on this rock He will build His Church. So far He is dealing with the human character of St. Peter. There is in His language, as it has been admirably explained,[4] a sense of relief,—the relief that comes of perceiving in St. Peter's deliberate acceptance of His divine claim a solid basis on which His spiritual fabric may be reared, or at least a basis capable of being solidified by discipline

[1] St. Luke xii. 41-43. The future καταστήσει is to be noticed; it is like the futures οἰκοδομήσω, δώσω, in St. Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

[2] M. Godet's comment on this parable is as follows (*Saint Luc* ii. p. 138): 'This utterance seems to imply that the apostolate will perpetuate itself till Christ's return; and in fact it is an irresistible conclusion from the figure employed, that there will remain in the Church to the end a ministry of the word established by Christ. The Apostles perceived this so clearly that, when they left the world, they were at pains to establish a ministry of the word to take their place in the Church. This ministry was a continuation of their own, if not in its completeness, at any rate in one of its most indispensable functions—that of which Jesus speaks in this parable—the regular distribution of spiritual nourishment to the flock. . . . The theory which makes the pastorate emanate from the Church, as its representative, is not scriptural. This commission is rather an emanation from the apostolate, and therefore mediately an institution of Jesus Himself.'

[3] St. Matt. xvi. 18, 19. I am taking the passages in the Gospels which refer to the apostolate as they stand: see above p. 5. It seems to me that the position assigned to the apostles in the Acts and the Epistles presupposes such commissions as in our four Gospels Christ is recorded to have given them.

[4] Holland *Creed and Character* p. 49. Cf. Hastings' *Dict. of Bible* iii. p. 795 f.

and experience till it becomes a foundation-stone on which the Church may rest. The rock then, of which Christ speaks, is the rock of human character confessing the divine claim. It is as men, as human characters, that the twelve Apostles are the twelve foundation-stones of the New Jerusalem. And, if the promise to St. Peter which follows must be interpreted of an official position which is to be given to him in the Church, we have here at starting an emphatic intimation that official dignity in the Church is meant to rest on a basis of moral fitness.[1] But does Christ pass in His promise to St. Peter from words which concern his moral character to words which imply his spiritual office? He certainly does. He promises that He will give him 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' or of the Church, and this is in other words a promise to make him the official steward of the divine household. When Shebna was substituted for Eliakim in the treasurership or stewardship of the house of David, this was the word of the Lord:[2] 'I will call my servant Eliakim the son of Hilkiah: and I will clothe him with thy robe, and strengthen him with thy girdle, and I will commit thy government into his hand. . . . And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; and he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open.' It is promised, then, that St. Peter shall be made the steward of the divine household,[3] and this carries with it an authority to 'bind' or 'loose,' that is to prohibit or permit—in a word, to give legislative decisions—with that heavenly sanction and

[1] Christ, however, in choosing Judas, whom He 'knew from the first,' among the Twelve, showed that He distinguished between moral worth and spiritual authority, and this is also implied in His words about the Jewish authorities (St. Matt. xxiii. 2, 3): 'the scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you, that observe and do, but do not ye after their works.'

[2] Isai. xxii. 20-22; cf. Bp. Moberly *Great Forty Days* pp. 127-130.

[3] Of course subordinately to Christ (Rev. iii. 7).

authority which is the proper endowment of the kingdom of heaven.[1]

Two questions may be raised with reference to this promise. What, it may be asked *first*, is St. Peter's relation, in respect of this official position, to the other Apostles? The answer seems to be that the official position is here not given but promised, and that the commissions actually given after the resurrection, the commissions which are seen in action in the apostolic history, are given to the whole apostolic body, and acted upon by all alike with the same authority, though St. Peter is their leader.[2] A question may be raised *secondly* as to St. Peter's relation to the whole Christian community: for on another occasion, when Jesus Christ was speaking of the duty, under which His disciples might lie from time to time, of bringing one of their brethren under the censure of the Church, He attributes to the local church as a whole that authority to bind and loose—which in its application to individuals is of course a judicial authority—

as (*a*) the representative apostle,

and (*b*) administrative officer of the Church:

[1] See Edersheim *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* ii. pp. 81-85. Binding or loosing referred simply to the prohibition or else permission of things or acts. It was one of the powers claimed by the Rabbis. But in relation to persons it implies a judicial, administrative power.

[2] St. Cyprian's opinion in this sense has been already quoted: p. 154 n.[1]. It coincides with Origen's in the East (*in Matt.* xvi. 18, 19) and represents in fact the general mind of the early Church. So Theophylact (*in loc.*): 'They who have obtained the grace of the episcopate as Peter had (οἱ κατὰ Πέτρον τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς ἀξιωθέντας χάριτος) have authority to remit and bind. For though the "I will give thee" was spoken to Peter alone, yet the gift was given to all the Apostles. When? When He said "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted." For the "I will give" indicates a future time—the time, that is, after the resurrection.' Perhaps the strongest evidence of the truth of this view is the absence of any special claim made by, or for, St. Peter in the Acts or Epistles, especially in St. Peter's own first Epistle, where (v. 1, 2) his pastoral charge (St. John xxi. 15-17) is identified with that of the elders; and on the other hand St. Paul's strenuous claim to be, as an apostle, dependent on none but Christ and in no respect inferior to the others; see Gal. i. 11, 12, ii. 1-10. This of course admits of a primacy being assigned to St. Peter, so that οἱ περὶ Πέτρον can be the name for all of them, as in Ignatius *ad Smyrn.* 3 and the 'shorter conclusion' of St. Mark's Gospel (as given in the Greek MS. L and the Old Latin MS. *k*: printed, under the heading ἄλλως, in Westcott and Hort's text).

I deal briefly with this matter because this book is meant to be simply a vindication of the catholic idea of the ministry and not to go into questions which arise within the area where this finds acceptance. Tertullian's view of the meaning of the passage now in question, referred to on p. 191, is essentially the view of a Montanist.

to which He again declares the supernatural sanction to attach.[1] The answer to this question has already been indicated when the general subject of the relation of the ministry to the Church was under discussion. The supernatural authority does inhere in the Church as a body, but the Church has (not by her own but by Christ's authority) executive officers, and it is through them that her judicial power is put into effect. Christ makes two promises: He promises judicial authority to the Church, and He promises to make St. Peter a steward, an administrative officer in the Church with special reference to this power; and these two promises are correlative, not contradictory.

(2) the commission to the whole apostolic body after the resurrection,

(2) Christ's dealings in the last days of His ministry are wholly concentrated upon the twelve. With them alone He celebrates the Last Supper and institutes the memorial of His death, which He commits to them to be perpetuated in the Church;[2] to

[1] St. Matt. xviii. 15-18. The declaration is still future, it is a promise. Afterwards follows the promise which attaches to the prayer of even two disciples (ver. 19), based on the fact that Christ's presence is with even so small a number as two or three if they are gathered together 'in His Name' (ver. 20: that is, in the knowledge of Him and in accordance with His will). This last declaration applies primarily to the promise which attaches to united prayer, for the 'two or three' refers back to the 'if two of you shall agree to ask.' It may however also refer to the promise of judicial authority, and would mean that this authority is not dependent on numbers, but can be enforced by even two or three in accordance with His will, if they can speak with the voice of the Church so that to disobey them would be to 'refuse to hear the Church.' Cf. among the *Pirqe Aboth* of Dr. Taylor p. 60 f. [ed. 2 p. 46 f.]: 'When ten sit and are occupied in words of Thorah, the Skekinah is among them, for it is said, God standeth in the *congregation* of the mighty. . . . And whence [is it proved of] even three? Because it is said, . . . and hath founded his troop in the earth. And whence even two? Because it is said, Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another.' Cf. note[15]: 'Every ten men that are assembled in the synagogue, the Shekinah is with them, for it is said, God standeth in the 'edah, etc. And whence even three that *judge*, because it is said, He judges among gods, etc.' i.e. the divine presence is amongst even three who constitute a *beth din*, or house of judgment, to administer justice. So Christ may have meant that His presence is with the smallest 'court of justice' which represents the Church. Cf. *Expositor*, March 1887, p. 229.

[2] The Eucharist was certainly regarded from the first in the Church as a sacrifice. 'The conception of the whole action of the Lord's Supper as a sacrificial action (Opferhandlung) is found clearly in the *Didache* (c. xiv), in Ignatius, and especially in Justin (*Apol.* i. 65 f.). But Clement of Rome also presupposes it when he (cc. 40-44) draws a parallel between the bishops and deacons and the O. T. priests and Levites, and indicates the προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα as their principal function' (Harnack *Dogmengesch.* i. 152

them He addresses the last discourses, which are calculated to prepare them in character and intelligence for the withdrawal of His visible presence and the

n.[1] [ed. 4 p. 231 n.[1]]). See *Didache* xiv: Κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ Κυρίου συναχθέντες κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε προσεξομολογησάμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, ὅπως καθαρὰ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν ᾖ . . . αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ῥηθεῖσα ὑπὸ Κυρίου· Ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ καὶ χρόνῳ προσφέρειν μοι θυσίαν καθαράν. Justin *Dial. c. Tryph.* 41: Καὶ ἡ τῆς σεμιδάλεως προσφορά, ᾧ ἄνδρες, ἔλεγον, ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαριζομένων ἀπὸ τῆς λέπρας προσφέρεσθαι παραδοθεῖσα, τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους, οὗ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιρομένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρίας ἀνθρώπων, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῖν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν: the offering, he explains, is to be made in thanksgiving for the blessings of creation and of redemption through Christ's death; he then quotes the usual passage from Malachi i. 11, 12 and continues: περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας, προλέγει τότε εἰπὼν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ δοξάζειν ἡμᾶς, ὑμᾶς δὲ βεβηλοῦν. Irenaeus iv. xvii. 5: 'Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis . . . eum qui ex creatura est panis, accepit et gratias egit, dicens: Hoc est meum corpus. Et calicem similiter, qui est ex ea creatura quae est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est, et novi testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam ecclesia ab apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo.'

It would not be in place here to discuss at length the sense in which the early Church believed the eucharist to be a sacrifice. Briefly however it is in place to remark that

(1) the whole language of the earliest Church seems most easily interpreted, if we suppose that the bread and wine, chosen out of the general offerings of the congregation and presented before God as a memorial of Christ's sacrifice with accompanying prayers, were regarded as constituting the thank-offering (eucharist) or oblations (gifts) of the Church and as expressive of that relation of sonship and purity and freedom of approach to God, which belonged to the Church in virtue of her redemption, as being the 'high-priestly race.' These 'gifts' were then offered for the consecration of God. They became 'no longer common bread but eucharist, made up of two substances, an earthly and an heavenly'; they became to the Church 'the Body and Blood of Christ.' This response of God to the Church's invocation, this mingling of heavenly and earthly things, gave to the Church's sacrifice a new power and brought it into essential union with the One Sacrifice, with 'Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant,' and with 'the blood of sprinkling.' But for this, the Church's sacrifice would have been most Judaic in character:

(2) the consent of the Church in regarding the eucharist as a sacrifice appears to fix the meaning of Christ's words of institution. In this connexion it requires to be observed: (*a*) That Justin Martyr interprets ποιεῖν as='to offer' (*Dial. c. Tryph.* 41, just quoted, and 70), and this use of the word is *common* in the LXX without any qualification; e.g. in Exod. xxix. 36-41, Lev. ix. 7-22, it occurs ten times. But it lacks support in the New Testament and generally in Fathers and Liturgies. It enables us, however, in St. Luke xxii. 19, 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25 to give, as is natural, the same meaning to τοῦτο in both corresponding clauses, τοῦτό ἐστιν . . . τοῦτο ποιεῖτε: and in 1 Cor. xi. 25 also to make τοῦτο the accusative, as the sentence requires, to both verbs, ποιεῖτε and πίνητε. (*b*) That there is, in the words of institution, an obvious reference to the words of Moses in Exod. xxiv. 8, ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης. The blood there referred to is blood of sacrificial application—'blood of sprinkling.' Accordingly, the blood of Christ in the Eucharist is His blood considered as being sacrificially poured out or shed, and the body of Christ in the Eucharist is His body as being offered 'for us.' (*c*) That ἀνάμνησις in the LXX means a memorial before God; see Lev. xxiv. 7, Num. x. 10, Ps. xxxvii. [xxxviii.] and lxix. [lxx.] (titles); but, on the other hand, see Wisd. xvi. 6, Heb. x. 3, and the references in the liturgies: Μεμνημένοι οὖν ὧν δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπέμεινεν, κ.τ.λ. See more at length *The Body of Christ* (Murray, 1901), pp. 264 ff. and note 20 pp. 312 ff.

substitution for it of that new and higher mode of inward presence by His Spirit, which He should give to His Church when He was glorified. In all this Christ is dealing with them no less as apostles[1] than as representative disciples. After His resurrection He does not cease to deal with them in the latter capacity, but it would appear that the commissions, which in the 'great forty days' were no longer promised but given, were addressed to them in their official character and to them alone. It would appear to be undeniable, if it had not been so often denied, that these commissions, taken together, are commissions given to an abiding *apostolate*, destined to be permanent till 'the end of the world.' The 'eleven disciples' are expressly mentioned as the subjects of the commission recorded by St. Matthew as given on the 'mountain where Jesus had appointed them,' which invested them with His royal power to go and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the threefold Name and teaching them to observe all His precepts, and which was accompanied by the promise of His presence with them 'all the days till the completion of the age.'[2] The parallel account of the commission of Christ given in the verses which at present conclude St. Mark's Gospel describes it as given 'to the eleven.'[3] In St. Luke's narrative, where in connexion with Christ's appearance on the evening of His resurrection mention is made of 'the disciples and those who were with them,' it is noticeable that, though there is a record of encouragement and enlightenment and promise, there is no record of a ministerial commission.[4] There was, however,

as in St. Matthew,

'St. Mark,'

[1] See St. Luke xxii. 14, 29-30; St. John xiii. 16, 20, xv. 16, xvii. 18.

[2] St. Matt. xxviii. 16 ff. It is urged that, as there were 'some who doubted,' so others must have been present beside the Apostles. I should have thought that, as a matter of Greek, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν must express a subdivision of 'the eleven,' who are the subject of the whole sentence. See Meyer *in loc.* At any rate they are the only people mentioned in connexion with the commission given.

[3] St. Mark xvi. 14-18.

[4] St. Luke xxiv. 33 f., but cf. Acts i. 1-5.

such a commission, given apparently on this occasion, which is recorded by St. John.[1] It is there described as given to 'the disciples'; but this expression at the end of St. John's Gospel commonly refers to the twelve, who are the subjects of His typical training.[2] The words of the commission, moreover, and the analogy of that recorded in St. Matthew and St. Mark, seem to make it natural to conclude that, though others may have been present, it was addressed to the Apostles only.[3] 'As the Father hath sent Me,' Christ said, 'even so send I you,' and when He had said this, He breathed on them and said: 'Receive ye holy spirit:[4] whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; whosesoever and St. John:

[1] St. John xx. 19-23.

[2] So Dr. Westcott, on St. John xxi. 1, says that by 'the disciples' is meant 'in all probability the apostles, the disciples in the narrower sense, though "the Twelve" were not all assembled on this occasion, but at most "seven" only.' This use of the word 'disciples' may be illustrated by a passage closely parallel to that under discussion. Our Lord's prayer in St. John xvii. is spoken amongst 'the disciples' (xvi. 29, xviii. 1). Yet by this is meant 'the Twelve' (St. Matt. xxvi. 20): thus He prays for them as those whom the Father 'has given Him' (xvii. 6, 9, 11) and whom 'He guarded,' so that 'not one of them perished but the son of perdition' (ver. 12), and whom He 'has sent into the world,' as the Father sent Him into the world (ver. 18). These are clearly the definite body, the Twelve; and the expression 'As thou hast sent me, so have I sent them' (ver. 18) interprets that in xx. 21.

[3] I am of course aware that I have Dr. Westcott against me (*Revel. of the Risen Lord* pp. 81-83 and Comm. *in loc.*), as well as many others. On the other hand I am following M. Godet, one of the best modern commentators on St. John; and the arguments which seem to me of determining force in the matter are

(1) The parallel commissions to 'the Eleven' in St. Matthew and St. Mark.

(2) The obvious reference to the apostolate in the words of St. John xx. 21; cf. xvii. 18. (The use of πέμπω in the former case hardly weakens the force of this.)

(3) The habitual reference of 'the disciples' at the end of St. John's Gospel to the Apostles.

(4) The implication of the Acts (as bearing on all the commissions taken together); if the Acts is accepted as historical, undoubtedly the Apostles must have received a commission distinct from the Church as a whole to account for their position.

On the other hand (*a*) the presence of 'those with them' does not seem to be, in this case, more than in the case of any later ministerial commissions, an argument against the limitation to the Apostles; (*b*) the absence of St. Thomas is no hindrance to the commission having been given to the Apostles, as such. The narratives are fragmentary, and we cannot say but that St. Thomas may have had his loss by absence made good to him. He was present among the eleven to receive the commission recorded in the other Gospels.

[4] Λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 12, where πνεύματα=χαρίσματα, and St. John vii. 39 where τὸ πνεῦμα=the Holy Ghost and πνεῦμα=His inspiration (Westcott *in loc.*). The distinction of meaning between πνεῦμα and τὸ πνεῦμα was already pointed out by Didymus of Alexandria in his treatise on the Holy Spirit see Jerome's Latin version § 15 (*Opera*, ed. Vallarsi, ii. 123, 124).

sins ye retain, they are retained.' Here the opening words contain a manifest reference to the apostolate, and the subsequent act of breathing, with the words accompanying, seems to be the actual bestowal in power and spirit of those 'keys of the kingdom' which Christ had formerly promised to the chief of the Apostles. What is bestowed is a judicial power with a supernatural sanction—the power, in pursuance of Christ's redemptive mission, to admit men into the new covenant of absolution, and to exclude them from it, according to considerations of their moral fitness.

(3) the commission restored to St. Peter.

(3) If the threefold pastoral commission to St. Peter[1] represents, as seems most probable, simply a personal restoration of St. Peter to the position of trust which his threefold denial might be supposed to have lost him, then we shall only be justified in concluding from our Lord's words on that occasion that the pastoral care, to govern and to feed, was supposed to be involved in the apostolic commission.[2]

Conclusion as to Christ's institution of the apostolate.

It may very well be maintained that it would be impossible to draw certain conclusions on the matter which has been under discussion from the four Gospels, if they existed as isolated documents with no history of the Church to interpret them; but from a mere examination of the narratives the conclusions arrived at above appear to be the most probable, and as a fact they are supported by all the evidence of church history from its beginning. It would appear, then, that Christ founded not only a Church but an apostolate in the Church, an apostolate moreover which was intended in some real sense to be permanent; this apostolic office included all that was

[1] St. John xxi. 15-17.
[2] St. John xxi. 15, 17, *βόσκε*, 16 *ποίμαινε*.

necessary to perpetuate that mission on which the Father had sent the Son into the world: it involved the authority to teach in Christ's name, to govern, and to feed, and in this sense was described as a stewardship and pastorate: in order to its function of government, a supernatural sanction was attached to its legislative and judicial authority: and finally the two great sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist were committed to its administration.[1]

Whether, then, it be true or no to say that the Church began *in* a ministry,[2] it appears certainly true to say taht the Church began *with* a ministry. Those who had received the commission of the apostolate, and those who had not, awaited side by side—the same in discipleship but different in office and function—that Pentecostal gift which was to make all alike and for the first time, in the full sense, members of the Church of Christ.

[1] Nothing is said to explain the sense in which baptism and the eucharist respectively were committed to the apostolate. As a matter of fact St. Paul regarded the actual administration of baptism as not specially characteristic of the apostolic office. On the other hand it should be noticed that there is no mention in the Gospels of the institution of that which in the Acts appears as the complement of baptism and as specially administered by the Apostles, the rite of laying-on of hands. Much would become clearer to us if we realized how entirely, in the early Church, baptism and the laying-on of hands were regarded as two parts of the same sacrament.

[2] See Gladstone *Church Principles* pp. 201-2: 'In the Apostles, then, the Christian Church, properly so called, potentially lay, at the moment when our Saviour uttered those sacred and momentous words, which St. Matthew has conveyed to us; but it had no other existence; and if we take that moment of time for our point of view, we see the heavenly gift arrested, as it were, on its passage from God to man, given from Him, but not yet arrived at its destination; not yet communicated to us; just as the loaves and the fishes were, after Jesus had given thanks and broken, and had given them to the twelve to distribute, but before they had actually served them to the multitude. . . . And so it was to remain until the day of Pentecost.' Cf. the same writer's *Gleanings* iii. p. 262: 'No doubt (as I for one believe) the Church began with a clergy; nay, began in a clergy.' I should have thought, however, that before the day of Pentecost there were others besides the apostolic clergy who were, in the same sense as they, members themselves of the Church. 'The number of names together were about an hundred and twenty.'

CHAPTER V

THE MINISTRY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

THE task now before us is to investigate the witness of the apostolic Epistles and of the Acts of the Apostles as to the origin and nature of the Christian ministry and its development in the first period of the life of the Church. The most convenient method will be first to marshal the evidence and then to draw the conclusions which it seems to warrant. Accordingly we begin with the evidence of St. Paul's Epistles.

I. The evidences of St. Paul's Epistles. (*a*) The apostle

I. First of all then, St. Paul gives us in each group of his Epistles[1] a vivid impression of what he understood by the ministry of an apostle.[2] He is one

[1] Except with regard to the Epistle to the Galatians, which many scholars are now inclined to place first in time of all the Epistles, there is fairly general agreement about the chronological order of the Epistles. The two Epistles to the Thessalonians constitute the earliest group. Then come the two Epistles to the Corinthians, with those to the Romans and (according to the ordinary view) the Galatians—all bound together by close connexions in subject and tone. Then follow 'the Epistles of the first captivity' to the Philippians, the Colossians, the Ephesians, and to Philemon. Last come the Pastoral Epistles. I endeavour above to indicate how natural and harmonious a result is derived from the evidence of all of them, taken as genuine, on the subject of the ministry.

[2] I.e. in the narrower sense, so that a man could rank with 'the Twelve.' We find the term used also in a wider sense in 2 Cor. viii. 23: Rom. xvi. 7, where Andronicus and Junias, St. Paul's kinsmen, are spoken of as 'of note among the apostles': Phil. ii. 25, where Epaphroditus is spoken of as St. Paul's fellow-labourer and 'the apostle' of the Philippian brethren, ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον καὶ λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου. In the latter case the word probably means no more than the messenger sent by the Philippians to minister to St. Paul's need: see Lightfoot *in loc.*, but cf. Clem. *ad Cor.* 44 οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν: Theodoret *in loc.* says: ἀπόστολον δὲ αὐτὸν κέκληκεν αὐτῶν ὡς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν αὐτῶν ἐμπεπιστευμένον. In the former cases however (and possibly in the latter) the term apostle is probably used much in the sense in which we find it in the *Didache*—perhaps as equivalent to 'evangelists.' For the idea that it included the seventy, see Salmasius *de Episcop.* p. 61: cf. p. 198 *supra* n.[3].

who, having seen Christ after His resurrection and so become qualified to witness to that fundamental fact,[1] has received by no mediating hands but personally from Christ a definite mission.[2] An authoritative mission is indeed essential for all evangelistic work, for 'how shall men preach, except they be sent?'[3]—how, that is, can any one take upon himself so responsible an office? But for an apostle it is essential that this mission should be direct from Him who said: 'As my Father hath sent me, so send I you.' Such a direct mission, actual and unmistakable from Christ Himself, St. Paul believed himself to have received and was recognised as having received by his fellow-apostles, who had been appointed in the more normal way while Christ was still on earth.[4] The function of the apostle was primarily that of proclaiming the Gospel.[5] He had become a 'steward of the mysteries of God'—an administrator, that is, of the divine revelations, which, having been kept in the secret counsels of God through ages and generations, had, now that the fulness of the time was come, been declared through the Incarnate Son.[6]

a teacher

This office involved at once absolute subordination and lofty authority. For on the one hand the apostle was 'the slave of Jesus Christ.' As he had no personal, arbitrary lordship over the faith of the disciples,

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8.

[2] Gal. i. 1: οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου. Timothy's mission on the other hand, though not ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, was δι' ἀνθρώπου (2 Tim. i. 6). St. Paul cannot have regarded the event recorded in Acts xiii. 1-3 as more than a recognition by the Church of a mission which he had already received from Christ.

[3] Rom. x. 15.

[4] St. Paul was an ἔκτρωμα (1 Cor. xv. 8); but he was recognised by his fellow-apostles. See Gal. ii. 7-9.

[5] 1 Cor. i. 17: 'Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel' (for the reason of this see vv. 14, 15): 1 Cor. ix. 14 (Alford's comment here is quite beside the mark): 1 Thess. ii. 4-9: 1 Tim. ii. 7. 'Preaching the Gospel' is the primary function of the apostolate, or of the general ministry, as distinguished from the local ministry, whose primary function was administration. Cf. in Clement of Alexandria *Quis Dives* 42 how St. John does not himself baptize the young man but hands him over to the local ἐπίσκοπος.

[6] 1 Cor. iv. 1: οἰκονόμος μυστηρίων θεοῦ. Cf. Eph. iii. 1-13.

so he could proclaim nothing of his own: it was quite beyond his power to alter or innovate upon 'the word of God' which constituted his message.[1] On the other hand it involved a plenary authority to teach and to govern: for the message was not one to be cast loose as a disembodied truth among mankind, it was to be the basis on which organized societies were to be built. The apostle accordingly was a founder and ruler of Churches, with divine authority given him for their edification—ruling them all alike on the basis of a common tradition of doctrine and practice, and claiming from them the obedience of affectionate children to their spiritual father.[2] And inasmuch as the whole purpose of Christ's coming is to reconcile man to God, so of course the authority of an apostle is that of an empowered ambassador and minister of the reconciliation with God which Christ has won: 'God hath put in us,' says St. Paul, 'the word of reconciliation.'[3] It was 'in him,' moreover, not merely in word as a message, but in power; so that he could pass sentence on the sins of individuals, to retain or forgive them, with a sanction which is not only supernatural in the spiritual sphere but miraculous also in the physical. An offender whose sins merit condign punishment can be 'delivered to Satan,' that he may be taught by physical penalties

and governor:

[1] He is personally a δοῦλος (Rom. i. 1), officially a ὑπηρέτης (1 Cor. iv. 1) or διάκονος (1 Cor. iii. 5, 2 Cor. iii. 6, iv. 1). 2 Cor. i. 24: οὐχ ὅτι κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως. Gal. i. 8: ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίσηται [ὑμῖν] παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Thus again St. Paul distinguishes between his own judgment and the command of Christ (1 Cor. vii. 6, 10, 12, 25, 40). The primary requirement of his ministry is faithfulness to Christ (1 Cor. iv. 2).

[2] 2 Thess. iii. 14, ii. 15; 1 Cor. iv. 14-21, xi. 16, 34; 2 Cor. xiii. 10, x. 8 περὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἡμῶν, ἧς ἔδωκεν ὁ κύριος εἰς οἰκοδομήν. (The word ἐξουσία expresses also the right to be supported which accompanied the apostolate, 2 Thess. iii. 9, 1 Cor. ix. 5 f.) The 'word of God,' which the apostles minister, is declared in 1 Cor. xiv. 36 to be authoritative over all churches alike; cf. 1 Cor. iv. 17, xi. 16, xiv. 33. See also 2 Cor. xiii. 3: τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ, and 2 Tim. i. 13: ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαινόντων λόγων ὧν παρ' ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας.

[3] 2 Cor. v. 18, 19: τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ . . . δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς, ὡς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν . . . θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς· ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν.

'not to blaspheme.'[1] This plenary authority over individuals, which St. Paul describes himself in his pastoral Epistles as exercising in the case of Hymenaeus and Alexander in his single person, we watch him in his Epistles to the Corinthians exercising in conjunction with the Corinthian congregation. He rebukes the church there for not having 'removed out of their midst,' or according to the later church phrase 'excommunicated,' an incestuous man. Thus, where they had shown only too great a readiness to forgive, St. Paul proceeds, as controlling their action, to judge or to retain the sin. And, because this judgment of a sin has a miraculous physical sanction attached to it, it is described as 'delivering such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh,' in order that the physical penalty may startle him to repentance, and 'his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord.'[2] Again in the second epistle we find him dealing with a penitent brother who had been put under punishment by the corporate action of the Corinthian church—probably not the same person as is referred to in the first epistle.[3] In this case, the punishment having had its proper effect in producing penitence, St. Paul exhorts the congregation to receive back their penitent brother and, again taking the initiative upon himself, speaks of himself as, with the church, forgiving him 'in the person of Christ.'

[1] 1 Tim. i. 20: παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ; 1 Cor. v. 5: παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ, and Stanley's note *in loc.*, citing Job ii. 6 παραδίδωμί σοι αὐτόν.

[2] 1 Cor. v. 3-5: κέκρικα τὸν τοῦτο κατεργασάμενον ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ, κ.τ.λ. St. Paul seems to imply that the Corinthian Church, endowed as it was with the gift of 'government,' could have removed the evil-doer out of their midst by the disciplinary authority belonging to the community; cf. ver. 13. But probably only the apostle could inflict the physical punishment; see Alford *in loc.* It has been remarked above (p. 40) how clear cut is the distinction in this passage between 'those within,' whom the Church has a right to 'judge,' and 'those without,' over whom she has no such right (vv. 12, 13).

[3] 2 Cor. ii. 5-11: cf. 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14, 15. The punishment is spoken of as inflicted by the community in general (οἱ πλείονες) and the forgiveness also is assigned to them (ᾧ δέ τι χαρίζεσθε, κἀγώ), but St. Paul apparently has to take the initiative. For the expression ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ, cf. ἐν ὀνόματι . . . Χριστοῦ 2 Thess. iii. 6.

his ministry catholic.

An apostle can thus bring his authority to bear on the details of the life of a single congregation, but, speaking broadly, his ministry is of the general or catholic order. He has 'the care of all the churches.' He represents the general Church rather than the particular churches. It is in this respect that the apostolate is primarily distinguished from the local ministry, of the origin of which we get no clear information in St. Paul's Epistles, but which yet appears as a recognised institution in that epistle which is commonly regarded as of earliest date. Over against the catholic authority of the apostle is the local authority of the 'presidents,' who 'labour amongst' the Thessalonian Christians and keep them in mind of their duties.[1] There were similar 'presidents' as well as 'ministers' and 'teachers' amongst the Roman Christians,[2] and corresponding officers of 'government' and 'assistance' amongst the Corinthians.[3] But in

(*b*) The local ministry:

[1] 1 Thess. v. 12: τοὺς κοπιῶντας ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν ἐν Κυρίῳ καὶ νουθετοῦντας ὑμᾶς. They are to be esteemed very highly for their work's sake. For κοπιᾷν cf. 1 Tim. v. 17 οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ, and generally of labourers for Christ, apostolic or others, both male and female, Rom. xvi. 6, 12, 1 Cor. xv. 10, xvi. 16. It is to be noticed that St. Paul addresses to the whole church (1 Thess. v. 14 f.) admonitions, the execution of which would fall to the presidents; see esp. v. 14 νουθετεῖτε τοὺς ἀτάκτους. Government was a function of the whole community exercised through certain official organs. It should be noticed that the Thessalonian Church needs to be admonished not to 'quench the spirit' or 'despise prophecy.' Its tendencies to disorder proceeded from a different cause to those which existed among the Corinthians.

[2] Rom. xii. 6-8. The different 'charismata' mentioned here are prophecy, ministry (διακονία), teaching, exhortation (παράκλησις), distribution, presidency, administration of mercy. This has a vaguer appearance than any of St. Paul's other lists of church gifts or officers. The prophet, the teacher, the president, the deacon, are well-known figures, and the ministration of mercy may refer to such a function as that of Phœbe, 'the deaconess' (xvi. 1, 2), unless indeed hers is the διακονία (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 15) and the deacon is ὁ μεταδιδούς. But it still remains difficult to assign a distinct office to ὁ παρακαλῶν and ὁ ἐλεῶν. It has to be noticed that the Roman Christians had not yet been organized by any apostolic person into one Church; cf. xvi. 5, 10, 11, 15.

[3] At Corinth the 'distinctions of gifts' (διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων), each with its accompanying ministry (διακονία) and power (ἐνέργημα), are the word of wisdom, the word of knowledge, faith, gifts of healings, workings of miracles, prophecy, discernings of spirits, kinds of tongues, interpretation of tongues (1 Cor. xii. 4-11). These are strikingly different from those mentioned among the Roman Christians. They are much more miraculous and abnormal. The corresponding list of officers in the Church is (vv. 28-30): apostles, prophets, teachers, powers (i.e. workers of miracles), gifts of healings, helps (ἀντιλήμψεις, which may well correspond to the deacon's office), governments (κυβερνήσεις, which probably represents the 'presidents' of the

the Epistles to Corinth and to Rome these other 'ministries' are presented to us from a new point of view. The Church, as the Spirit-bearing body of Christ, is viewed as a richly diversified organism in which the life common to all is yet not given to all alike or to all for the same function. There is a great variety of 'gifts,' that is of special spiritual or miraculous endowments imparted to different individuals over and above the spiritual gift necessary for the Christian profession as such;[1] so that the Christian Church is presented to us as a great spiritual hierarchy of graduated orders or powers, with apostles, prophets, teachers, rulers, helpers, ministers of mercy and exhortation, workers of miracles, speakers with tongues, interpreters—each class being not self-constituted but instituted and empowered of God.[2]

among the spiritual endowments of the Church

A hint in the Epistle to the Romans would indicate—what is of course amply corroborated in the Acts of the Apostles and the Pastoral Epistles—that these spiritual gifts, though they are specially described as the gifts of God's Spirit, were mediated through the apostolic agency.[3] Otherwise, though it is implied that the gifts were actual, recognisable endowments in all cases and were subject to the

Church), kinds of tongues. 'Are all,' St. Paul adds, 'apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all powers? have all gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?' He is here clearly intent on asserting the principle of unity in variety, not on enabling us to distinguish the variations.

[1] The word *χάρισμα* is used for an ordinary 'favour' or 'gift' of God, as in 2 Cor. i. 11. But it gets a technical sense in which it is distinguished from the fundamental spiritual qualifications of faith and love (1 Cor. xii. 4 and 31, cf. xii. 1, xiv. 1).

[2] The household of Stephanas is described in 1 Cor. xvi. 15 as having set themselves to minister to the saints: *εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς*. In consequence the Corinthians are exhorted to be subject to them, as to all workers for Christ. The reference is here probably to a ministry of mercy in general. These persons set themselves to supply the Church's needs, like good Christians in later days. There is probably no reference to any special office, and their authority is such as has been allotted to 'patrons' of the Church in later days; cf. *προστάτις*, used of Phœbe (Rom. xvi. 2).

[3] Rom. i. 11: *ἐπιποθῶ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς ἵνα τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν πνευματικὸν εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς*: cf. Acts viii. 14 ff.

apostolic order in their exercise, we have no information as to how they were communicated, or, when they were non-miraculous, like the gift of 'government,' how they were recognised. Some, however, of the gifts which caused the Corinthian church to present such an appearance of wealth in spiritual endowment were not destined to take a very important or permanent place in the equipment of the Church. The gift of tongues is heard of but for a little while, and the gifts of healing and miracles do not appear again, any more than some of the functions mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans as constituting distinct offices in the Church. In the Epistles of the next group the more permanent ministries of the Church are seen to emerge into clearer prominence. Christ, says St. Paul to the Ephesians, after His ascension 'gave some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers.'[1] Here, with St. Chrysostom, we may recognise the apostles and prophets (who are elsewhere in this epistle classed together as the recipients of the divine secrets now revealed and as the foundation-stones of the Church[2]) as constituting, with the less clearly-defined evan-

there emerge into prominence

[1] Eph. iv. 11. The 'pastors and teachers,' under one τοὺς δέ, represent the same officers. The different orders are, as has been remarked, first divinely gifted (ver. 7) and then themselves God's gifts to the Church (ver. 11).

[2] Eph. iii. 5, ii. 20. These prophets are, no doubt, the prophets of the new covenant. This seems to be generally admitted as to Eph. iv. 11 and iii. 5. But Chrysostom and others among the ancients, with Estius etc. among moderns, explain Eph. ii. 20 of the O. T. prophets. But it seems manifestly wrong to separate this passage from the other two.

The intimations we get of the position of prophets in the earliest Church are somewhat perplexing. On the one hand they are given, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, as in Acts xiii. 1, 2 and in the *Didache*, a position of very great importance in the Church as a whole, closely allied to that of apostles. On the other hand, in the Epistle to the Corinthians, though prophets are ranked next to apostles, the gift of prophecy is regarded as a gift belonging to the local church and exercised in it (1 Cor. xiv. 29-33, 39); cf. also Acts xix. 6. It would appear that at least certain persons with the gift of prophecy occupied a prominent place as prophets and were ranked in that capacity close to apostles as founders of the churches: see Eph. iii. 5, ii. 20, and Acts xiii. 1, 2, where Paul and Barnabas are ranked as 'prophets and teachers' and are afterwards called 'apostles' (xiv. 4). All who were given an occasional power of prophecy were not 'prophets,' e.g. those in Acts xix. 6. Cf. App. Note I, p. 353.

gelists, the general or catholic ministry of the Church; while the pastors and teachers, as local officers,[1] are easily identified with the 'bishops' whom we hear of, coupled with 'deacons,' in the inscription of the Epistle to the Philippians.[2] There was, we should gather, a college or group of 'presidents' or 'bishops' in each community who discharged the office of government, and acted, subordinately to the apostles and prophets, as pastors and teachers of the flock. To these was also attached the 'assistant' ministry of the 'deacons.' This is borne out in the Pastoral Epistles, where we learn further that these local 'presidents' or 'bishops' were also known as 'presbyters.'[3]

local 'bishops' and deacons.

The Pastoral Epistles are the *locus classicus* in the New Testament on the subject of the Christian ministry. Elsewhere St. Paul writes to churches or to a private Christian like Philemon, but here he writes to his own representatives, evangelists and ministers of Christ like himself, on the duties of their office. And these Epistles themselves supply the

The importance of the Pastoral Epistles:

[1] Chrysostom says on Eph. iv. 11: ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους τοὺς ὁλόκληρον ἐμπεπιστευμένους ἔθνος· τί οὖν; οἱ ποιμένες καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι ἐλάττους; καὶ πάνυ, τῶν περιϊόντων καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένων οἱ καθήμενοι καὶ περὶ ἕνα τόπον ἠσχολημένοι. He goes on however to cite Timothy and Titus as instances of the latter class.

Chrysostom here clearly does not (like Ambrose and Theophylact) identify evangelists with deacons. It is true that Philip, one of the seven (who in Acts viii. clearly has not the apostolic function), is in Acts xxi. 8 called 'the evangelist'; but this was not in virtue of his 'diaconate,' but of his conversion of Samaria. There is also no reason why he should have remained in the lower office. The work of Timothy is described as that of an 'evangelist,' and such a relation to the apostolate suits better the rank assigned here to the evangelists.

[2] Phil. i. 1: σὺν ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις. These are different officers.

[3] Titus i. 5-7. More is said below (pp. 219, 227, and App. Note K, p. 362) on the identity of 'bishop' and 'presbyter.' The προϊστάμενος among the Thessalonian and Roman Christians = the office of 'government' among the Corinthians = the 'bishop' among the Philippians = the 'pastor and teacher' among the Ephesians = the 'presbyter' of the Pastoral Epistles. This is at least what St. Paul's Epistles suggest taken as a whole. The vague use of terms at first need not surprise. See Winterstein *Der Episkopat* (Leipzig, 1886) p. 11. The term presbyterate covers the episcopate long after this latter term had gained its later distinct sense. The apostolate is called by implication διακονία by St. Paul in 1 Cor. iii. 5; cf. 1 Tim. iv. 6, 2 Tim. iv. 5, and Acts i. 25; also (with reference to the Psalm) an ἐπισκοπή in Acts i. 20. Again, Pothinus is spoken of in the Epistle of the Churches of South Gaul as 'having been entrusted with the διακονία of the ἐπισκοπή' (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1. 29).

answer to the question what may have prompted the change of method. It was because the circumstances of St. Paul's last days led him to emphasize the necessity for government in the Church. In the department of doctrine he saw an unpractical profane spirit of speculation springing up, on a Jewish basis, but already displaying that sort of false spiritualism, that horror of what is material and actual, which has constantly characterized oriental thought, and which found such a conspicuous development, in a direction most opposed to Judaism, in the Gnostic movements of the second century.[1] This speculative tendency was frequently joined to a self-seeking proselytism and a thinly-veiled covetousness ;[2] and it allied itself with a terrible tendency to lawlessness, which clouded the whole moral atmosphere of the Christian Church, whether in regard to civil authority and secular occupations, or in the relations of master and servant, or in the inner sphere of church life.[3] There was a special need of government, then, in the circumstances of his last years, and this not only in face of the moment but even more in view of the future. In the earlier period of his life St. Paul seems to have expected the second coming of Christ during his own lifetime.[4] In these Epistles, on the other hand, he certainly contemplates his own death and, as in his speech to the Ephesian elders, views with apprehension the characteristics of lawlessness and disobedience, which he foresees will mark 'the last days' after he is gone, both in the department of doctrine and of life.[5] Both in view of present and

[1] 1 Tim. i. 4-7 ; iv. 1-5 ; vi. 20, 21 ; 2 Tim. ii. 16-18 ; Titus i. 10-16, iii. 9. The intellectual and moral phenomena in Ephesus and Crete are closely parallel. St. Paul's insistence on the duty of praying for secular rulers and all men (1 Tim. ii. 1-5—observe the emphasis on πάντες—and iv. 10) seems aimed at a tendency which was anticipating the later Gnostic exclusiveness and depreciation of nature.

[2] Tit. i. 10, 11 ; 2 Tim. iii. 6, 7 ; 1 Tim. vi. 4, 5.

[3] 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2 ; Tit. ii. 9, iii. 1-3 ; 2 Tim. iii. 1-8.

[4] See 1 Thess. iv. 15 ; 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52.

[5] 2 Tim. iv. 6-8, cf. iii. 1-6, iv. 1-5 ; 1 Tim. iv. 1-5 ; cf. Acts xx. 17-35.

of future conditions, then, there is a profound need to stir up that gift of government which God has given to the Church.

Nevertheless it is no new thing which in these Epistles St. Paul is emphasizing. Just as in the Epistle to the Colossians he develops a doctrine of the person of Christ which had been implied in the expressions of his earlier Epistles, and in the Epistle to the Ephesians works out the doctrine of the Church which had been more briefly suggested in his Epistles to the Corinthians; so now he emphasizes that idea of governmental and doctrinal authority in the Church which had been an element in his earlier teaching, especially in his Epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians, and consequently lets that gift of government, which in the Corinthian church had been associated with other more exciting but less permanent and necessary endowments, emerge into greater isolation and distinctness.

their witness

We may class under three heads the lessons as to the ministry which are to be derived from these Epistles to Timothy and Titus.

(i) on presbyter-bishops

First, as to the local ministries of bishop and deacon, if we do not gain much new information, on the other hand we have a greater clearness and definiteness given to the picture we can form of their office. Thus the 'episcopus' is also called 'presbyter'; and, though the latter title would naturally suggest a dignity associated with the reverence due to age[1] and indicate rather a position than (like the

[1] Thus, though indicating a definite office with an assigned κλῆρος (1 Peter v. 3 and Huther *in loc.*), the title presbyter still retained its natural meaning and could be put into antithesis to 'young men' (1 Peter v. 5, Clem. *ad Cor.* 1. 3: for later instances of the same usage see p. 270 n.[3]). Later we have presbyter used, not only in its technical sense, but as a title of veneration for the Fathers of the Church by Papias ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39. 3, and Irenaeus *ib.* v. 20. 4: 'the elders before us and those associated with the Apostles.' Cf. St. John's acceptance of the title for himself in 2 John 1 and 3 John 1. Thus the title presbyter, like that of deacon, retained a broader, side by side with a stricter, use. There is not I think sufficient reason to attach the idea of a definite office to the term 'young men' in Acts v. 6.

first title) a definite office, yet this will not bear being pressed. A word is used for old men distinct from the title of presbyter,[1] and the latter is markedly identified in the Epistle to Titus with the title of bishop.[2]

These 'bishops' constituted a college or group of 'presidents' in each church,[3] and are spoken of as being really entrusted with the care of the Church.[4] They share the apostolic stewardship, and that not only in the sense of administration, but also in the sense of being entrusted really, though subordinately, with the function of teaching.[5] The proper discharge of their office is secured by their being carefully chosen, after due probation, in view not only of their moral fitness, but also of their capacities as rulers and teachers.[6] The lower ministry of the deacons is provided for in the older and more developed church of Ephesus, not in the newer churches of Crete, and it too is to be entrusted only after a due scrutiny of the moral fitness of the man who is to hold it.[7] We gain no light upon the functions of the diaconate, except so far as that the deacons,

and deacons;

[1] πρεσβύτης, Tit. ii. 2.

[2] Tit. i. 5-7. This is quite unmistakable. There is nothing more in the singular ἐπίσκοπος (Tit. i. 7, 1 Tim. iii. 2) than in the singular πρεσβύτερος (1 Tim. v. 1).

[3] 1 Tim. iv. 14 τὸ πρεσβυτέριον; cf. Tit. i. 5. Baur at first maintained that κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους meant one presbyter in each city, but he abandoned the contention. See Holtzmann *Pastoralbriefe* pp. 208, 209.

[4] 1 Tim. v. 17 οἱ . . . προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι; iii. 5 ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ἐπιμελήσεται.

[5] Tit. i. 7 θεοῦ οἰκονόμον, cf. ver. 9 παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ . . . καὶ τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν: cf. 1 Tim. iii. 2 διδακτικόν, v. 17 μάλιστα οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ (this need hardly imply that there were any presbyters who did not teach at all), 2 Tim. ii. 2 ἱκανοὶ ἕτερους διδάξαι. ὁ κατηχῶν in Gal. vi. 6 seems in the context to be a local officer.

[6] 1 Tim. iii. 1-7; Tit. i. 6-9. μὴ νεόφυτον is omitted in reference to the newly established church of Crete, and τέκνα ἔχων πιστά takes its place, see Kühl *Die Gemeindeordnung in den Pastoralbriefen* (Berlin and Neuruppin, 1885) pp. 13, 14: for an account of this and other works on the Pastoral Epistles see below p. 224 n.[2]

[7] 1 Tim. iii. 8-13. The fact that the requirements for the diaconate are nearly the same as those for the presbyterate is to be accounted for by the consideration that the requirements are negative. St. Paul requires much of the Christian, as such. His requirements for the ministry are mainly such as are involved in the absence of any positive reproach—in what we should call 'a good character.' There are distinct offices in the Church, not different standards of living for clergy and laity.

by contrast with the presbyters, would not be required to teach or to rule.[1]

(ii) on the extension of apostolic office to legates,

Secondly, we gain important information as to the extension of the apostolic office. In Timothy and Titus we are presented with apostolic delegates,[2] exercising the apostolic supervision over the church of Ephesus and the churches of Crete respectively.[3] They are not indeed what St. Paul and the other Apostles were, the original proclaimers of a revelation; they stand in this respect in the second rank, as entrusted only with the task of maintaining a tradition, of upholding a pattern of sound words.[4] But in this task they exercise the supreme apostolic authority, and not in this respect only. To them belongs the function, in Titus' case of founding, in both cases of governing, the churches committed to them.[5] They ordain men to the church orders after being duly satisfied of their fitness, and exercise discipline even over the presbyters.[6] Again, as it is their function to maintain the truth, so in defence of it they are to oppose false teachers, and when these exhibit the temper of separatists and heretics and will not 'hear the Church,' they are to act in the

[1] On the inferiority of the diaconate, see Kühl *Gemeindeordnung* pp. 15, 16.

[2] Simcox *Early Ch. Hist.* p. 140 calls them 'vicars apostolic.' Lightfoot *S. Ignatius* i. p. 377 speaks of their exercising a 'moveable episcopate': in *S. Clement of Rome* ii. p. 433 he calls them 'itinerant bishops.' Winterstein, *Der Episkopat* p. 18, calls them 'apostolische Delegaten.' Cf. Rom. xvi. 21 ὁ συνεργός μου.

[3] How many more of such 'viri apostolici' there may have been we cannot tell. The διακονία of Archippus at Colossae (Col. iv. 17) may have been like that of Timothy at Ephesus. And there may be truth in such a tradition as that mentioned by Dionysius of Corinth (see above p. 114) as to the position of the Areopagite in the church of Athens, or that mentioned by Origen as to the position of Gaius at Thessalonica.

[4] 2 Tim. i. 13; cf. 1 Tim. i. 3, iv. 11, 13, vi. 3: παραγγέλλειν, διδάσκειν, ἀνάγνωσις, παράκλησις. 2 Tim. iv. 2 ἔλεγξον, ἐπιτίμησον; Tit. i. 13 ἐλέγχειν ἀποτόμως, ii. 15 ἐλέγχειν μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς. The παραθήκη intrusted to Timothy is the truth he is to teach and hand on to others (1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. i. 14).

[5] As e.g. in matters of worship and female behaviour (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, 8, 9, 11).

[6] Tit. i. 5, 1 Tim. v. 22: it seems to me probable that St. Paul is in this latter place speaking of the laying-on of hands in ordination, not in the reception of a penitent; see, however, Pacian of Barcelona *Par. ad Poen.* 15 [8], Ellicott *in loc.*, and Hort *Ecclesia* p. 214: 1 Tim. v. 19-21; these judicial powers apparently rest on Timothy's own judgment without appeal.

spirit of Christ's directions and leave them to their wilful courses, having nothing further to say to them.[1] We do not, however, gather that they possessed the miraculous power to inflict physical penalties, which St. Paul describes in his phrase 'delivering unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh.' As apostolic legates, then, Timothy and Titus exercise what is essentially the later episcopal office, but it would not appear that their authority, though essentially permanent, was localized like that of the later diocesan bishop.[2] Timothy indeed had been left at Ephesus by St. Paul to represent himself in view of that church's needs, and St. Paul certainly contemplates his continuing his ministry after his own death,[3] and presumably in the same church of Ephesus, in which again it would appear that he had been solemnly ordained to his office.[4] Nor perhaps can we argue against his localization from the fact of St. Paul summoning him to Rome, or from the fact of his having gone there.[5] But there is a close analogy between the office of Timothy and that of Titus, and Titus certainly appears to have left Crete to join St. Paul, to have been his companion at Rome, and

who act as later bishops,

but are not diocesan;

[1] Tit. iii. 10, 11. This 'rejection' of a heretic seems to express the idea of St. Matt. xviii. 17. He is to be as one avoided—as 'the gentile or the publican.' He is among 'those without.' See for an interesting comment on the passage Origen *c. Cels.* v. 63, where he describes the true method of dealing with opponents of the faith.

[2] Dr. Lightfoot calls the usual conception of Timothy by church writers as 'bishop of Ephesus' the 'conception of a later age' (*Dissert.* p. 199), but he also describes it as not altogether without foundation. 'With less permanence but perhaps greater authority, the position occupied by these apostolic delegates nevertheless fairly represents the functions of the bishop early in the second century.' Perhaps then the only question in dispute between Dr. Lightfoot and one who, like Prof. Shirley (*Apostolic Age* p. 116), represents the office of Timothy and Titus as 'episcopal in the full range of its power' is as to the exact localization of the office. It can hardly be denied that Timothy and Titus possessed a permanent authority as apostolic delegates, with a permanent χάρισμα—in this sense a 'delegatio perpetua.' The only question is whether it was limited to one place, or still, like the apostolic office which it represented, general.

[3] 2 Tim iv. 1-8.

[4] The presbytery of 1 Tim. iv. 14 is presumably the presbytery of Ephesus, but see Hort *Ecclesia* p. 184. On the other hand 'the good confession' (1 Tim. vi. 12) apparently refers to Timothy's baptismal profession: note esp. the ἐκλήθης, and cf. Kühl *op. cit.* p. 29 n.[3].

[5] 2 Tim. iv. 9, Hebr. xiii. 23.

to have left again not for Crete but for Dalmatia.[1] Again we do not gather from these Epistles any clear intimation that Timothy and Titus, though they were to provide for a succession of sound teachers,[2] were to ordain men to succeed them in their apostolic office in the local churches. All that we can fairly conclude is that St. Paul after ordaining, or with a view to ordaining, the local ministers, bishops and deacons, appointed delegates to exercise the apostolic office of supervision in his place, both before and after his death: and the needs which required this extension of the apostolic ministry were not transitory ones. They were the needs of 'the last times'—the constant phenomena of moral failure and doctrinal and moral instability and disorder. It should be added that no definite title is assigned to Timothy and Titus, though their function is spoken of as a 'ministry' and as 'the work of an evangelist,'[3] and Timothy at least is distinguished from the presbyters as a comparatively young man.[4] No doubt the necessity for fixed titles grew greater with lapse of time and increase of controversy.

(iii) on the idea of ordination.

Thirdly, the Pastoral Epistles give us a clear view of St. Paul's conception of the ministerial office. Beyond what constitutes the gift of the Christian life, the apostolic 'minister'[5] is spoken of as qualified for his work by a special ministerial gift or 'charisma'—'a spirit of power and love and discipline'—imparted to him (after his fitness has been indicated by prophetic intimations) in a definite and formal manner, 'by means of the laying-on of the hands of the

[1] Titus iii. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 10.

[2] 2 Tim. ii. 2.

[3] 2 Tim. iv. 5, 1 Tim. iv. 6. It should be noticed that St. Paul calls his own ministry also a διακονία (1 Tim. i. 12) and speaks of himself as a διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν, as well as κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος (ii. 7, 2 Tim. i. 11). It is most likely, I think, that Timothy and Titus would have been known as evangelists.

[4] 1 Tim. iv. 12; cf. pp. 219 n.[1], 270 n.[3].

[5] I assume that what St. Paul says of Timothy he could have said of Titus also—no great assumption, as their offices are so wholly similar.

apostle,' or 'with the accompaniment of the laying-on of the hands of the presbytery.' [1]

In this process there was one feature which was not destined to be permanent. The prophetic indication of the person to be ordained gradually ceased. The 'bishops' of the later Church owed their appointment not to prophecy but to some other means of election. And indeed, even in the earliest days, the prophetic voice was only one means of selection to office. But it is only a very arbitrary criticism which can fail to see here, save in the single point of nomination by prophecy, the permanent process of ordination with which we are familiar in later church history, and that conception of the bestowal in ordination of a special 'charisma,' which at once carries with it the idea of 'permanent character,' [2] and that

[1] 2 Tim. i. 6, 7: ἀναμιμνήσκω σε ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου· οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα δειλίας, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ. (The ἡμῖν here refers surely to St. Paul and Timothy classified together in the ministry.) 1 Tim. iv. 14: μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος ὃ ἐδόθη σοι διὰ προφητείας μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου. 1 Tim. i. 18: κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφητείας. With this last expression compare Acts xiii. 2 and Clement of Alexandria *Quis Dives* 42, where he describes St. John as κλήρῳ ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος σημαινομένων. And the διὰ προφητείας of the second passage seems to refer to these same prophetic indications, to which equally with the laying-on of apostolic hands Timothy owed his office. The use of διά as applied to the apostle, while μετά is applied to the presbytery, would naturally indicate the secondary and unessential position of the latter in the act of ordination. But I doubt whether when the prepositions are used in different epistles it is fair to lay as much stress on the contrast as is sometimes done. Besides, 'the presbytery' who lay on hands may include the Apostle himself (cf. 1 Peter v. 1, where the Apostle calls himself a presbyter among presbyters): i.e. the local officers, with the apostle amongst them, may still be described as 'the presbytery.' Dr. Chase *Confirmation in the Apostolic Age* (Macmillan, 1909) pp. 35 ff. interprets 1 Tim. iv. 14 of ordination, but 2 Tim. i. 6-7 of confirmation, though he acknowledges that he is perhaps alone in so doing. But I think that St. Paul's exhortation in the latter passage is not merely a personal exhortation to a Christian but, as appears more clearly in the second chapter, the exhortation of an apostle to his representative. I think σωφρονισμός means more naturally the disciplining of others than self-discipline or soberness: that is to say, it is a specially ministerial gift. On the whole I remain of the common opinion that the reference in both passages is the same—to the laying-on of hands in ordination.

[2] The 'charisma' is described as a permanent endowment which having been once received requires only to be 'stirred up,' like baptismal grace: 2 Tim. i. 6. The idea expressed by χάρισμα in the Pastoral Epistles is exactly the same as that expressed by πνεῦμα (not τὸ πνεῦμα) in St. John xx. 22. Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 12, where πνεύματα = πνευματικὰ χαρίσματα.

Since Baur (*Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus*, 1835) denied the Pauline authorship of these Epistles and emphasized as a ground for this

distinction of clergy and laity which is involved in the possession of a definite spiritual grace and power by those who have been ordained. It is also arbitrary to deny that St. Paul, when he appointed Timothy and Titus to ordain presbyters and deacons, as we gather, by the same process of laying on hands,[1] would have hesitated to attach the same ideas to the subsequent ordinations made by them.

The final conclusions which are to be drawn from what St. Paul tells us about the church ministry shall be reserved till we have finished our review of the New Testament literature.[2]

rejection their hierarchical character, a prolonged controversy has been carried on in Germany—the one party emphasizing everything hierarchical and sacerdotal in these documents, and denying their Pauline authorship on that account; the other party minimizing these characteristics, and then vindicating their Pauline authorship. Thus on their premisses the party of denial (of whom H. J. Holtzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe kritisch und exegetisch behandelt*, 1880, is a distinguished representative) has a motive to exaggerate the sacerdotalism of the Pastoral Epistles, and the party of vindication (as represented in the able work of Kühl, 1885, *Die Gemeindeordnung in den Pastoralbriefen*) a motive to minimize it. If Holtzmann is exaggerating when he sees in οἱ λοιποί of 1 Tim. v. 20 an expression for the laity (as was Baur when he saw in Timothy and Titus the prototypes of archbishops), on the other hand he seems to me to say no more than is true in the following passage (*op. cit.* p. 231): 'Es ist also keine Frage, dass der Ausdruck χάρισμα in den Pastoralbriefen die bestimmtere Bedeutung einer, vermittels der Ordination übertragenen, Amtsgabe besitzt. Erst bei solcher Auffassung versteht sich endlich auch die beidemal stehende Formel τὸ χάρισμα ἐν σοί, weil ein mit der Begabung zugleich übertragenes Amtsrecht allerdings seinem Träger mehr einwohnt, als blos beiliegt. Fiele die Handauflegung 1 Tim. v. 22 mit den bisher besprochenen Stellen in eine Kategorie, so würde Timotheus hier überdies noch davor gewarnt werden, die ihm inhärirende Gabe vorschnell weiter zu tradiren.' So he quotes Weizsäcker (p. 233): 'Man sieht, hier ist eine ganze, festgeschlossene Kette von Begriffen, in welcher kein Ring fehlt; der Inhalt des Ganzen aber ist das Amt als Inhaber der reinen Lehre und des rechten Geistes, verbürgt durch eine förmliche und sichere Uebertragung.' 'Das Amt ist daher im eigentlichen Sinne die Lebensbedingung für den Bestand und Geist der Gemeinde.'

[1] 1 Tim. v. 22: χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει: cf. Acts vi. 6.

[2] It ought to be added that St. Paul recognises a ministry of women in the Church; see Rom. xvi. 1: Φοίβην τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν, οὖσαν [καὶ] διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς. But it is a ministry which is concerned with works of mercy and, if with teaching also, only in private (Acts xviii. 26). St. Paul clearly excludes women from public teaching (1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35; 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12). A woman may however have the gift of prophecy (1 Cor. xi. 5), and St. Paul apparently contemplated her exercising that in public. We naturally wish that we knew more of the position of prophetesses, like Philip's daughters (Acts xxi. 9), in the earliest Church. On the whole, however, St. Paul clearly excludes women from public teaching; and, at least in his Epistle to Timothy, he is doing this for communities situated in a general society which allowed great freedom to women. 'Under the Roman Empire we find women [in Asia Minor] magistrates, presidents at games, and loaded with honours. The custom of the country influenced even the Jews, who in at least one case appointed a woman at Smyrna to the position of archisynagogos,'

II. Evidence of the other Apostles.

II. There is very little additional information to be derived from the other apostolic Epistles, but there are indications which must not be neglected. It will be borne in mind that, though the apostolic office was essentially ecumenical, yet a distribution, not of area but of races, had been arrived at among the Apostles. It was recognised that St. Paul had been divinely 'intrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with the gospel of the circumcision,' and it was accordingly agreed that Paul and Barnabas should evangelize the heathen, while James, Peter, and John preached the same Gospel amongst the Jews.[1] But the arrangement was only temporary. Certainly the Epistles neither of St. Peter nor of St. John were written to specially Jewish Christians. Only St. James can give us any insight into the organization of a distinctively Jewish community. Thus, while we note indications in all the Epistles both of an apostolic and a local ministry,[2] a special interest attaches

Ramsay *The Church in the Roman Empire* pp. 67-8. 'The prominence assigned to women was,' Sir W. Ramsay explains, 'firstly, pagan rather than Christian, and, secondly, heretical rather than Catholic,' pp. 161-2, cf. 403. But it appears that the dignities of women in pagan society were honorary rather than administrative. There is no evidence that they could assist at assemblies or give votes or speak in public. See my *Ephesians* (John Murray, 1898) p. 227. Probably what was allowed and forbidden them in the Church represented pretty fairly the allowances and prohibitions of secular life.

[1] Gal. ii. 7-9.

[2] Thus James writes as himself a teacher with the authority which we know him on other grounds to have held in specially Jewish circles, and speaks (iii. 1) of local teachers and more unmistakably (v. 14) of presbyters.

Peter writes as an 'apostle of Jesus Christ' (1 Pet. i. 1, cf. 2 Pet. i. 1), but identifies himself as a presbyter with the local presbyters (1 Pet. v. 1-5) as sharing the same pastoral office. He speaks also (1 Pet. iv. 10, 11), in language which reminds us of St. Paul's, of the Church as differentiated by different 'charismata' for different ministries intended for the common good. Each man's charisma makes him a 'steward of the manifold grace of God.' The stewardships or charismata of which he especially speaks are those of speaking in God's name and of ministering. If, as is probable, these refer to the presbyterate and the diaconate, we have here another case to add to those of Eph. iv. 11 and 1 Tim. v. 17 of the presbyterate being considered a teaching office.

St. Jude indicates that Korah, the author of revolt against the Old Testament priesthood, had, as well as the self-seeking pastors whom Ezekiel denounced, his followers in the Church of the new covenant (Jude 11, 12).

The Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of 'leaders' (ἡγούμενοι) in the Christian Church who had spoken the word of God and were passed away, alluding apparently to apostolic teachers (cf. Acts xv. 22, Luke xxii. 26), and he uses the same expression

to the evidence of St. James. By what title are the local ministers known to him? In St. Paul's Epistles, as we have seen, they are called first 'presidents,' then 'bishops,' and in the Pastoral Epistles also 'presbyters.' Now while the first of these titles is of the most general significance, the second, though it is used in the Old Testament and its use in the Christian Church was certainly influenced by this fact, was of common acceptance in the Greek of the empire to express 'commissioners' or 'superintendents' of many different sorts.[1] The title 'presbyter,' on the other hand, was a specially Jewish title, and was in familiar use at any rate in Jerusalem. St. James is pre-eminently a Jew of Jerusalem writing to Jews,[2] and accordingly he uses the term 'presbyters' for the local church rulers among the Jews of the dispersion; but on the other hand, while Jewish presbyters had been merely judicial officers, and not officers of worship, nor teachers, the Christian presbyters have assigned to them by St. James a 'ministry of healing,'[3] both of body and soul, with accompanying prayer, which has no analogy in the Jewish presbyterate, while it accords naturally

St. James.

of the rulers of the Church still living, who exercise the office of pastors over the Hebrews, 'watching for their souls as those who shall give account' (Heb. xiii. 7, 17), and he bids the Hebrews to 'greet them' (xiii. 24). This title will be considered further in connexion with Clement's letter, p. 284 f.

[1] See App. Note K, p. 356, on the origin of the terms 'episcopus' and 'presbyter' in connexion with modern criticism.

[2] See especially the use of the word 'synagogue' (James ii. 2) for the Christian place of meeting.

[3] The 'elders of the Church' (James v. 14-16) are assumed to have the gift of healing by means of unction, accompanied by their 'prayer of faith' (cf. St. Mark vi. 13). But as sickness is the symbol, and often the effect, of sin (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 30), so the healing is spiritual as well as physical—it is spiritual absolution with the miraculous sanction and evidence still attached (cf. St. Mark ii. 10): 'if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him.' Then follows a general admonition to confess sins mutually one to another. This probably implies that the sick man would have confessed his sins to the presbyters whom he had summoned. See Origen *in Levit.* ii. 4. Generally great light has been thrown on this practice of mutual confession among Christians by the passages in the *Didache*, iv. 14 and xiv. 1: 'On the Lord's day gather yourselves together and break bread and give thanks (εὐχαριστήσατε), having first confessed your sins, that your sacrifice may be pure.' The practice was derived from the Jewish synagogue; cf. Paul Sabatier *La Didaché* (1885) pp. 47, 48. Cf. also 1 John i. 9 and Westcott *in loc.*

St. Peter. with the general pastoral functions assigned to them by St. Peter.[1]

St. John. It may surprise us that, whereas St. John is specially connected in authentic tradition with the establishment of the 'monarchical episcopate' and with the general development of the ministry, we have hardly any information on the subject in his writings. If, indeed, the Apocalypse dates from the end of his life, we shall naturally see in the 'angels' of the seven churches of Asia some indirect reference to the responsible bishops.[2] But the mention of these angels cannot be put in evidence, because their primary meaning seems to be symbolical;[3] they seem to be

(The 'angels' prob. symbolic.)

[1] 1 Pet. v. 1-5. St Peter also (if he does not actually use the word ἐπισκοπεῖν in ver. 2, where the reading is doubtful) implies the use of the term ἐπίσκοπος by using it of Christ the 'chief pastor' (ii. 25, cf. v. 4).

[2] Cf. Origen *in Luc.* xiii. See p. 127 n.[2] (under § 3).

[3] The angels have been generally taken to be bishops, the use of 'angels' in Mal. ii. 7 and Eccles. v. 6 being quoted. If this is so, they are addressed as embodying the church, and Ignatius' language may be compared where he speaks (*ad. Trall.* 1) of 'seeing the whole community in the bishop,' and when he passes imperceptibly (*ad Polyc.* 5, 6) from addressing the bishop of Smyrna to addressing his church. But the identification of the angel with the church in the Apocalypse goes further than this, and the fact that the female personage, Jezebel (ii. 20), seems clearly symbolical would suggest a symbolical meaning for the angels also. So also the use of the whole book leads us to see in the angels symbolic representations of different agencies, *e.g.* Milligan (on Rev. x. 1-3 in Schaff's *Pop. Comment.* on the N. T.) is probably right in describing 'the strong angel' as 'neither the Lord, nor a mere creature executing His will, but a representation of His action. The angel by whom such representation is effected has naturally the attributes of the Being whose action he embodies.' The more in fact one studies the Apocalypse, the more the symbolical character of personages, numbers, and events is impressed upon one. So the angels of the seven churches seem to be ideal personifications of the temper or genius of the churches. See Lightfoot *Dissert.* pp. 199, 200; Simcox *Early Ch. Hist.* p. 172 n.[1]; Milligan *in loc.* For the other sense, see Trench *Epp. to the Seven Ch.* and Godet in *Expositor*, Jan. 1888, p. 67. Among the ancients, Arethas of Caesarea, using Andreas and other more ancient authors, interprets the angels first as guardian angels (who are addressed on behalf of the churches, as masters on behalf of their pupils: εἰδὼς ὡς οἰκειοῦσθαι φιλεῖ τὰ τοῦ μαθητοῦ ὁ διδάσκαλος, εἴτε κατορθώματα, εἴτε ἡττήματα), and then as the churches themselves (ἄγγελον τῆς Ἐφέσου τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐκκλησίαν λέγει); see Cramer's *Catena Graec. Patr. N. T.* viii. p. 200. So also the writer who passes for Victorinus of Pettau, the earliest commentator on the book; he clearly interpreted the angels as symbolical of classes of individuals, for he paraphrases the letter to the angel of Ephesus thus: 'ad eos scripsit [Ioannes] qui et laborant et operantur et patientes sunt et cum videant homines quosdam in ecclesia dispensatores praeposteros, ne dispersio fiat, portant, . . . Haec universa ad laudem spectant et laudem non mediocrem sed tales viros et talem classem et tales electionis homines oportet omnimodo admoneri.' So he deals with the other letters: 'aut ad eos scripsit . . . aut ad eos . . . aut ad eos, etc.' Origen *in Num.* xx. 3 interprets of angels in the strict sense (and hence Andreas, as above), and so Jerome on Mic. vi. init.

symbols of the temper or spirit of the different churches. In the same way, as we have other reasons for believing St. John to have instituted bishops, we shall probably be inclined to see in Diotrephes, with his ambitious self-exaltation and his power 'to cast out of the Church'[1] brethren who had come from St. John, one of these local bishops who was misusing his authority. But here again the indication is too ambiguous to constitute evidence of itself. It remains for us then to seek such additional information, especially on the origin of the local ministry, as can be derived from the Acts of the Apostles.

III. Evidence of the Acts. (α) The apostolate divinely appointed,

III. In the Acts of the Apostles we are presented first of all with a very clear picture of the apostolic ministry. Just exception can indeed be taken to M. Renan's phrase when he describes 'the divine institution of the hierarchy' as a 'favourite thesis' of St. Luke,[2] in so far as the phrase seems to carry with it too much implication of conscious design in writing; but it cannot be fairly denied that the divine authority of a hierarchy in the Christian Church does appear conspicuously enough in the course of St. Luke's narrative.

From the first the disciples appear as a body amongst whom eleven, or after Matthias' election twelve, are held to possess a ministerial office and commission direct from Christ.[3] Upon the whole body, thus differentiated into ministers and people, the Holy Ghost descends and the Church begins her life as the Spirit-bearing body, with the Apostles for her authoritative teachers and for her centre of unity. This is sufficiently implied in the phrase which describes the first new converts as 'continuing

with authority,

[1] 3 John 9-10. Diotrephes seems clothed with official power.

[2] *Les Apôtres* p. xxxix. Cf. P. Sabatier *La Didaché* p. 155: 'Déjà du temps de saint Luc on faisait précéder les décisions du concile de Jérusalem d'un préambule gros de toutes les prétentions hiérarchiques romaines' (i.e. such as M. Sabatier thinks were derived from the influence of the Roman Church upon Christianity).

[3] Acts i. 25: διακονία καὶ ἀποστολή: also by implication (ver. 20) ἐπισκοπή.

steadfast in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of the bread and the prayers.'[1] They are prominent in the early history as representing Christ, acting in His name to work physical miracles of healing on 'those without,' of judgment also on 'those within.'[2] Again, they have the authority to ordain to those various ministries of the Church, the origin of which will be considered shortly. Thus the church at Jerusalem set the seven (we are told) 'before the Apostles, and when they had prayed they laid their hands on them.'[3] When we hear afterwards of those later-added Apostles, Barnabas and Saul, 'appointing elders' in the churches which they founded,[4] we cannot doubt, especially in view of the evidence of the Pastoral Epistles, that the method of appointment was the same method of laying on hands with prayer; and we shall not be surprised that St. Paul should describe the presbyters at Ephesus, appointed as they must have been by his hands, as none the less instituted by the Holy Ghost.[5] It is indeed not only in the case of the appointment of the ministry that we are led to associate the action of the Holy Ghost with the laying-on of apostolic hands. The narrative of

and power to give the Holy Ghost by laying-on of hands

in confirmation

[1] Acts ii. 42: τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς.

[2] Acts v. 1-11. These judgments brought a great fear not only on the Church but on all who heard of them (ver. 11)—a fear of the Apostles. Afterwards we are told that they wrought many public miracles and all made public appearance as teachers in Solomon's porch (cf. iii. 11). Hence it seems necessary to interpret the words that follow 'of the rest durst no man associate himself with them' (κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς, cf. viii. 29, ix. 26, x. 28) as meaning 'of the rest of the Christians durst no man associate himself with the apostolic college on their public appearances.' A clear distinction appeared between them and the rest of the Christians. 'And the Jews as a whole held them in honour, and the Christian Church made rapid progress.' Only so do we get a natural interpretation of the passage throughout.

[3] Acts vi. 6.

[4] Acts xiv. 23: χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς κατ' ἐκκλησίαν πρεσβυτέρους. With reference to this word χειροτονεῖν Holtzmann remarks (*l.c.* p. 219): 'sprechen philologische Gründe allerdings mehr für die Bedeutung "erwählen" schlechthin als für "durch Stimmabgabe erwählen lassen,"' i.e. it had become a quite general word for 'to choose.'

[5] Acts xx. 28: προσέχετε . . . παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους. (The ἔθετο recalls 1 Cor. xii. 28: οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, κ.τ.λ.) The Holy Ghost had made them bishops by prophetic indications and the special χάρισμα bestowed upon them.

the Acts elsewhere assures us that the Apostles laid their hands on all Christians after their baptism, in order by this means to impart to them that gift of the Holy Ghost which is the essence of the Christian life. The laying-on of hands in 'ordination' is, as we should gather from the Acts and Pastoral Epistles taken together, a determination of this same divine gift to a special ministerial function, or the bestowal of a superadded power. Further we are led to believe that this function of the laying-on of hands —at least as a means to the bestowal of the Holy Ghost for Christian life or ministerial office—belonged normally to the Apostles alone.[1]

and ordination

This gift of the Holy Ghost, which is imparted to every Christian, was in the first days of the Church commonly accompanied by miraculous signs, such as 'prophesyings' and 'tongues';[2] and where the divine gift evidenced by such outward miracles preceded baptism and the laying-on of hands, the instrumentality by which the gift was ordinarily communicated followed in part—baptism apparently without the

(miraculous gifts do not dispense from ordination),

[1] See Acts xix. 6, and especially Acts viii. 15-19, cf. Rom. i. 11, 2 Tim. i. 6, 7. There is no such language about authority (ἐξουσία) or instrumentality (διά) used except of apostles. True, Ananias, a 'layman' apparently, laid hands on St. Paul. Whether this was the occasion of St. Paul receiving the Holy Ghost, as well as recovering sight, is not plain. Acts ix. 17 may suggest it. But, any way, Ananias received a special divine commission to do this thing. And it was essential to St. Paul's apostolate that he should not have received his spiritual gifts through other apostles. Again the prophets and teachers at Antioch lay hands on Barnabas and Saul. But here also we have a special divine authorization; and it is to set apart two already of their own 'order' to a special work (xiii. 2). Probably, however, these 'prophets' held quasi-apostolic 'authority' to lay-on hands in all cases. Who, unless Barnabas, can have 'confirmed' the people of Antioch?

[2] I assume that the bestowal of the Spirit was only *accompanied* by the miraculous gifts, while its essence lay in the bestowal of that presence which makes the Christian the temple of God. The miraculous χαρίσματα passed away, but the underlying gift remained, mediated by the same 'laying-on of hands.' I do not think this can be fairly questioned. In the Acts those who had not yet received 'the laying-on of hands' are represented not as being without certain miraculous powers, but as not possessing the Spirit. See viii. 16, xix. 3-7. The possession of the Spirit undoubtedly constitutes the essence of Christianity, with or without miraculous powers; see Gal. iii. 2 and Rom. viii. 9-17, where St. Paul speaks of it as received at a definite moment and as a permanent possession (ἐλάβετε, οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν). Cf. Hebrews vi. 2 for the close association of baptisms with the laying-on of hands.

laying-on of hands—but it became not the bestowal of a gift so much as the recognition of it.[1] In the same way the 'laying-on of hands' by the prophets and teachers at Antioch upon Saul and Barnabas, who had been themselves already classed under the same names, can hardly be regarded as more than the recognition by the Church, under the divine inspiration there recorded, of a mission which, at least in St. Paul's case, we have every reason to know came directly from Christ.[2] There may, in fact, have been many cases where the 'gift of government' evidenced by miraculous signs, or the recognised gift of prophetic inspiration, anticipated the appointment to the church office. But the ordination by the Church, where it was not needed as a channel of grace, was needed as its recognition. And the language of St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy and of the Acts makes the imposition of apostolic hands in ordinary cases, whether for 'confirmation' or 'ordination,' nothing less than the *instrument* of divine bestowal.

and power to bind and loose.

Once more, the narrative of the Acts brings before us in action that power of binding and loosing, that is of legislation with a supernatural sanction, with which Christ endowed His Church. Questions were raised at Antioch as to the obligation of the Jewish law on Gentile converts. Accordingly Paul and Barnabas with others were sent up by 'the brethren' to confer on this subject with the Apostles at Jerusalem, who appear as associated in this function with the elders. There ensued an apostolic conference, resulting in a formal decision by which certain things were loosed and certain others bound —i.e., according to the accepted reading and consequent interpretation of the passage, a certain amount

[1] Acts x. 44-48; cf. xi. 15-17 and the case of St. Paul.
[2] Acts xiii. 1-3; cf. Gal. i. 1, Acts ix. 15, xxii. 14-21, xxvi. 16.

of conformity to Jewish scruples was required of the Gentile converts, at least for the time, and in other respects the prescriptions of the law were declared to be not binding on them. This decision, issued in the name of 'the apostles and elder brethren,' was sent to those whom it concerned in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, with the unmistakable declaration: 'it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things.' [1]

(*b*) The sub-apostolic office

So far, then, it must be admitted that the narrative of the Acts gives us a very clear picture of the apostolic office and authority. But, on the other hand, the indications given us of the position of those 'prophets and teachers,' and other associates of the Apostles of whom we also hear, are somewhat indefinite.[2] James, though he apparently was not one of the twelve, is clothed with apostolic authority,[3] and (as we shall have occasion to note further) when the Apostles go forth to exercise their universal mission, remains to represent the apostolic office in the church of Jerusalem. How was he appointed? Probably not by the Apostles. Probably his authority would have been understood to have been given to him when Christ appeared to him after His resurrection.[4] And it must be remembered that though 'the Lord's brethren' had not been among the disciples who believed before the passion, there had been others who had not only believed but had been commissioned as representatives of Christ. Besides the Twelve there had been the seventy, and

of prophets and teachers,

[1] Act. xv. 1-29; cf. xvi. 4. If the 'Western' reading be preferred—which, by omitting 'things strangled' turns the ritual stipulations into moral stipulations about idolatry, bloodshed, and unchastity—the action by the apostolic conference was an even more drastic 'loosing' of the Gentile converts from the Jewish law.

[2] Acts xi. 27, xiii. 1, xv. 32, xxi. 10. [3] See esp. Acts xv. 13-21.

[4] 1 Cor. xv. 7. Cf. Dr. Ch. Wordsworth's *Remarks on Dr. Lightfoot's Essay* p. 19. 'The tradition in Clement of Alexandria represents James as appointed by the Apostles. But Hegesippus, who is a much better authority, speaks of him as 'succeeding to the government of the Church with the Apostles.' This will appear further on (p. 243).

among the 'hundred and twenty' disciples who awaited the day of Pentecost there must have been some who had received a commission in some respects like that of the Apostles. Tradition assigns this position to the Levite Joseph Barnabas among others.[1] We are not then going beyond probabilities if we consider that the original ministerial equipment of the Church before the day of Pentecost consisted of others besides the Twelve. Some of these may be amongst the prophets and teachers of whom we hear in the Acts, not as teaching only or foretelling, but as 'ministering to the Lord,'—performing, that is, acts of worship—and laying on hands to give the recognition of the Church to the mission of Barnabas and Saul.[2] There were, however, other fellow-labourers with the Apostles, who certainly did not belong to the original equipment of the Church. These we should certainly suppose would have received ordination from those who did. Such would have been St. Paul's sons in the faith, Timothy and Titus, as to the ordination of the former of whom by St. Paul we have positive information, which we naturally extend to similar cases.[3] Such ordination again we should suppose Apollos to have received;[4] nor is the silence of the Acts on the subject any objection to this view, for that narrative is silent also about his baptism and reception of the laying-on of hands,[5] which yet are not only mentioned but emphasized

and other fellow-labourers with Apostles.

[1] For Barnabas see Clem. Alex. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 1. 4.

[2] The Christian prophets in thus combining the ministry of worship with that of preaching recall the functions of Elijah and Samuel. With the phrase λειτουργούντων τῷ Κυρίῳ, cf. the *Didache* xv. 1: τὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων. This laying-on of hands, even though in this case it was only in recognition of a divinely-given mission, would probably imply a power to lay on hands in other cases. It should be noticed that, while Paul and Barnabas are here called 'prophets and teachers,' they are from this time onwards called 'apostles' (xiv. 4).

[3] Cf. Judas Barsabbas and Silas (Acts xv. 22, 32). Silas becomes St. Paul's companion (ver. 40), and is coupled with Timothy in 2 Cor. i. 19, and in the inscriptions of 1 and 2 Thess.

[4] St. Paul seems to class him with the Apostles as 'steward of the divine mysteries' etc. (1 Cor. iv. 1-6).

[5] Acts xviii. 24-28.

in exactly parallel cases.[1] It will, however, be of course acknowledged that miraculous evidence of the divine will, such as the Church could recognise, went far to reduce the ceremony of ordination to a lower level of importance than it held in ordinary cases.

(*c*) The local ministry

Leaving now the order of apostles, with its extension to prophets and teachers and other apostolic legates, it remains to collect the information given us in the Acts as to the origin of the local ministry. We find the existence of presbyters in the church at Jerusalem assumed.[2] This is probably to be accounted for by the fact that there Jewish 'presbyters' were an institution of old standing and that the Christian 'synagogue' naturally had the like. It is however very easy to exaggerate the Jewish character of these Church officers. Later evidence leads us to believe that they were definitely appointed to their office by the Apostles,[3] and that, while they shared their legislative counsels at Jerusalem and were associated in their legislative authority in a matter of church discipline, they were not, as amongst the Jews, merely disciplinary officers. St. James, as we have seen, assigns to them a ministry of physical and spiritual healing; St. Peter allots to them the general pastoral function; and in accordance with these indications St. Paul tells them at Ephesus that it is the Holy Ghost who has given them their office, and, calling them by the name of overseers or bishops, implies that the government and nourishment of the Church,[4] in the general sense, belonged to them. The subapostolic evidence

of presbyters

(= 'bishops')

[1] Acts xix. 1-6. These men had been baptized 'into John's baptism' (cf. xviii. 25 of Apollos: 'knowing only the baptism of John'). St. Paul saw to the baptism of these Christians and gave them confirmation. So again St. Paul himself had received baptism (ix. 18).

[2] Acts xi. 30, xv. 2, 4, 6, 23, xvi. 4, xxi. 18. [3] Acts xiv. 23.

[4] Acts xx. 28-31. They are to act as *pastors*, and this implies the double idea of feeding and governing. The former is more closely associated with the word βόσκειν than with ποιμαίνειν (St. John xxi. 15-17), but it cannot be excluded from the latter: see Jude 12 ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες = 'feeding themselves.'

concurs in allotting to the presbyter-bishops a clearly spiritual ministry.[1] Here in fact, as elsewhere, the Church adopted a Jewish nomenclature, but infused into the thing to which the old name was given a new spirit; and the hostility of the Jews to the Church certainly facilitated the process of distinguishing the ideas attached to the offices of the new Jerusalem from those which belonged to the old.

and deacons.

Besides the presbyters we hear of the institution in the church at Jerusalem of an inferior office. The occasion of its institution was the complaint of Hellenistic Christian Jews that 'their widows were neglected in the daily ministration,' apparently of food. In order, therefore, that this ministration of Christian charity might be carefully supervised without any hindrance to the Apostles in their higher 'ministry of the word,' a new office was created with a view to these 'works of mercy.' Seven, apparently Hellenistic,[2] Christians, 'full of Spirit and of wisdom,' are chosen by the community according to apostolic direction and ordained by the Apostles with the laying-on of hands and prayer.[3] In these seven we must see (with most authorities, ancient and modern [4]) the prototype of the deacons. In the case of some of these first appointed deacons, their peculiar gifts

[1] Clem. *ad Cor.* 44: the offering of the eucharistic gifts. The *Didache* (xv. 1) attaches the election of the bishops and deacons with an οὖν to the account of the eucharistic service, and associates their λειτουργία with that of the prophets and teachers.

[2] To judge from their names being Greek; but cf. Lightfoot *Dissertation* p. 188.

[3] Acts vi. 1-6.

[4] So Irenaeus III. xii. 10, IV. xv. 1, among ancients: so with most moderns Lightfoot and Renan. 'On donna,' says Renan *Les Apôtres* p. 120, 'aux administrateurs ainsi désignés le nom syriaque de *Schammaschin*, en grec Διάκονοι. On les appelait aussi quelquefois "les Sept" pour les opposer aux "Douze."' See Lightfoot (*Dissert.* p. 189), who also notes that the office here instituted cannot have been suggested by the ὑπηρέτης of the synagogue, who was more like a parish clerk (cf. St. Luke iv. 20; Schürer *Gemeindeverfassung der Juden* p. 28). On the other hand St. Chrysostom *in loc.* speaks doubtfully, but implies on the whole that this office antedated both the presbyterate and the diaconate, and was in fact special for this particular need. So Oecumenius: οὐ κατὰ τὸν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις βαθμόν. Cf. J. Müller *Die Verfassung der christlichen Kirche* (Leipzig, 1885), p. 10.

as preachers[1] sufficed to throw into the shade their humbler functions, but it is to be noticed that, though St. Philip can evangelize Samaria and baptize, he does not share the apostolic power to lay on hands.[2]

Summary. We are now in a position to sum up the results derived from our investigation of the origin, nature, and development of the Christian ministry, as it is presented in the writings of the apostolic period.

(1) The apostolate. (1) In the first place we have found that the conception of the apostolate which was derived from the Gospels is confirmed in the apostolic history. The Apostles are empowered by Christ and inspired by the Spirit as the primary witnesses of Christ's resurrection, stewards of the divine mysteries, ambassadors and ministers of the effected reconciliation of man to God. Their function is the ministry of the word or divine message, and inasmuch as the word is the basis of a covenant with a Church which is to be its 'pillar and ground,' so this apostolic ministry is not merely one of preaching. It involves the founding and governing of churches with Christ's authority, the administration in chief of discipline, and the accompanying authority to bind and loose with divine sanction. It involves also a ministry of grace. Besides administering the chief sacraments committed to them by Christ, the Apostles appear (with a reservation to be mentioned immediately) as alone possessing power to communicate the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying-on of hands. By means of this rite they bestowed both the fundamental grace of the Spirit's indwelling, which made

[1] Philip is called 'the evangelist' (Acts xxi. 8). This title is generally used in closer connexion with the apostolic office, which Philip had not; cf. Eph. iv. 11, 2 Tim. iv. 5: Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 37. 1, 2: and see above p. 217 n.[1] We must suppose either that the word had, like 'presbyter' and 'deacon,' a wider as well as a stricter use, or perhaps that Philip became later what, at the period described in Acts vi., he was not.

[2] Acts viii. 12-16.

a Christian the temple of God (and frequently carried with it in the first age a variety of special powers or 'charismata'), and also the particular 'charisma' which empowered men for the sacred ministry. The Apostles thus appear as the ordainers of an official clergy in the churches, by communicating to them through the laying-on of hands an empowering gift of the Holy Ghost. The presbyters in some, or all, cases of ordination assisted at this rite, but, as the evidence suggests, to give their assent and witness, not as chief agents.

(2) The sub-apostolic ministry.

(2) This apostolic ministry is in its essence universal. It is true that a temporary agreement assigned to Paul and Barnabas the evangelization of the Gentiles, while James, Peter, and John kept themselves to the Jews; it is true, further, that of these last-named 'Apostles,' St. James was very early localized at Jerusalem; still, in its primary character, the apostolate is not a localized but a general 'ministry of the word.' And in this general ministry others share. St. James himself was not an apostle in the sense of being one of the Twelve. Further, side by side with the Apostles, we hear of 'prophets' and 'teachers' and 'evangelists'—names somewhat indefinitely used—who shared the apostolic function of teaching. And, though they never appear as clothed with the same primary authority as the Twelve, yet 'prophets and teachers' share also the ministry of worship and the laying-on of hands. We recognise then an extension of the apostolic function in some of its main features (*a*) to 'prophets,' whose authority was guaranteed by the permanent possession of those miraculous powers which in the first age witnessed to the inner presence of the Spirit. Such men would have received either Christ's own commission before or after He left the earth, or, failing this, the recognition, as by the

laying-on of hands of those who were apostles and prophets before them, of that divine mission which their miraculous 'gifts' evidenced: (*b*) to apostolic men like Timothy and Titus, known probably as 'teachers' and 'evangelists,' who without, as far as we know, sharing miraculous power, had yet imparted to them by the laying-on of apostolic hands what was essentially apostolic authority to guard the faith, to found and rule churches, to ordain and discipline the clergy.

(3) Presbyter-bishops.

(3) Under this general ministry of the Apostles and their fellow-workers we find a local ministry of 'presbyters' or 'bishops,' who are appointed by the Apostles and ordained by the laying-on of hands to share in some particular community the pastorate and stewardship which Christ instituted in His Church. They are the local ministers of discipline —this being the function which was attached of old to the Jewish presbyterate—but they are as well the 'superintendents' in general of local affairs, the administrators of the churches; and as the churches are spiritual societies, so their function is spiritual. These local pastors are called also 'teachers' in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and we have no reason to suppose that they were not from the first, in a sense, 'ministers of the word,' though in subordination to apostles, prophets, and teachers. Again, since the earliest subapostolic writers speak of 'the offering of the gifts' or the ministry of the eucharist as the special function of the 'bishop,' and St. James presents the presbyters to us as exercising a ministry of healing, both physical and spiritual, we need not hesitate to regard them as having been from the first ministers of the sacraments.

(4) Deacons

(4) We are also presented with a subordinate ministry of deacons. If their primary function was to administer alms, yet they are also presented to

us as baptizing and teaching,—at least when they were endowed with qualifying gifts—though probably these functions did not belong to their office. Besides we find a female 'diaconate' as well as instances of 'prophetesses' in the Church, with regard to whose public ministry however we have no certain information. We also hear of other leading Christians who specially addicted themselves to works of mercy and received a corresponding authority.

and deaconesses.

(5) The conception of ordination.

(5) Finally the Pastoral Epistles give us an unmistakable picture of the conception attached by the Apostle St. Paul to the ceremony of ordination. He regarded the laying-on of his hands as the instrumentality through which Timothy received a special empowering gift of the Holy Ghost, which in virtue of this ceremony was 'in him' as a thing he might neglect or use, but which in either case was in him as at once his power and his responsibility. And we cannot but extend this conception to the ordinations of other clergy which Timothy is commissioned in his turn to make by the same ceremony of the laying-on of hands. Here we have the sacerdotal conception of a special order in the Church, differentiated by a special endowment.

Evidence is lacking as to

Two points may be mentioned in which the witness of the New Testament needs supplementing by the witness of the Church.

(i) exact division of functions:

First. We have no clear information as to the limitation of the functions of the different orders in the Church, except that to the 'viri apostolici' alone is the power attributed to impart the gift of the Holy Ghost by laying-on of hands. We have no clear information as to who exactly can celebrate the eucharist or who can baptize. But we must remember that the New Testament does witness to a

binding or loosing power in the Church and to a continuity in the Church's life. This enables us to rest satisfied with the fact that the principle of a ministry with different grades of function and power is given us in the apostolic age, and to accept in detail the mind of the Church, as soon as it declares itself, as representing the mind of the Spirit.

(ii) form of the future ministry.

Second. We have no determining evidence as to the exact form which the ministry of the future was to take. True the ministry of 'bishops' and deacons does appear in the New Testament as an almost essentially subordinate ministry, and we have clear evidence that the apostolic office admitted of being extended and localized, as in the case of St. James and (more or less) of St. Timothy and St. Titus; but all that the New Testament can be said to give us clearly is the principle that the church ministry is a thing received from above with graduated functions in different offices, so that it follows as a matter of course that there would always be persons who had the power to minister and persons who had also the power to ordain other ministers; with the corresponding position that only those who had the power communicated to them could exercise the function. What we do not get, then, is a distinct instruction as to what *form* the ministry was to take. Were the local bishops to receive additional powers, such as would make them independent of any higher order? Or were the apostles and apostolic men, like Timothy and Titus, to perpetuate their distinct order? and, if so, was it to be perpetuated as a localized or as a general order? These questions are still open.

CHAPTER VI

THE MINISTRY IN THE SUBAPOSTOLIC AGE

Two moments in the history of the Christian ministry have hitherto come under our notice. First, we have traced back the ministry of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, as church history makes us familiar with it, to the dim period of the middle of the second century. Secondly, we have seen it take its rise at the apostolic fountain-head. We have, so to speak, watched the Divine Founder of the Church separate and educate and institute the apostolate, and we have watched the Apostles at work, after the withdrawal of His visible presence, with the full consciousness of divine commission and authority. And in doing this we could not but perceive that, while in a certain sense they exercised a unique function—so far, that is, as they were the original witnesses and heralds of the revelation given in Christ,—in another sense they held a stewardship and pastorate of souls, a function of government and a corresponding power, which they did not conceive of as coming to an end with their own life: on the contrary, they provided for its continued exercise. The New Testament appears definitely to exclude the possibility that the functions exclusively discharged by the general or apostolic order in the first days (for instance, that of the laying-on of hands) lapsed altogether, so that the Church of the second century would, as it were, have re-developed an apostolic order of bishops from

below. Thus we have found in the records of the New Testament the origin and title-deeds of a permanent ministry in the Church, the outcome of the apostolate, and we have found in the latter half of the second century that this ministry has taken shape in the episcopal successions of the churches, which claim to perpetuate the apostolate in certain of its most fundamental functions.

Questions connected with the subapostolic ministry.

Now we approach the questions which are concerned with the junction and combination of these two groups of ascertained results. What are the links which connect the ministry of the apostolic age with that of the age of Irenaeus? are they such as to justify the claims which Irenaeus makes for the episcopate? In particular, does the history, so far as we can trace it, suggest that the apostolic authority was perpetuated from the first in a special office superior to that of the presbyters, though it came shortly to be known by a title at first synonymous with the presbyterate, viz. the episcopate? Or does the evidence, on the other hand, lead us to believe that the permanent functions of government and ordination hitherto exercised by apostles and apostolic men were, so to speak, put into commission in the local colleges of presbyter-bishops, and that subsequently these supreme functions, hitherto belonging to all in common, came to be limited to one who alone retained the title of bishop? With a view to answering the questions thus presented, we proceed to examine the historical links afforded by the sub-apostolic documents.

Links of evidence between the Apostles and the age of Irenaeus:

I

1. The episcopate at Jerusalem.

The first link is that supplied by the episcopate in Jerusalem derived from James. 'James,' says Hegesippus, 'receives the Church in succession with the

James the head of a line of bishops,

Apostles.'[1] This corresponds to the evidence of the New Testament. James ranks with the Apostles;[2] but, unlike the Apostles, he is localized in Jerusalem, where he presides with the presbyters,[3] and where at the apostolic conference he seems to hold the office of president and speaks with something like decisive authority, suggesting and probably framing the apostolic decree.[4] Thus it has been common from the earliest times to see in James the 'bishop of Jerusalem' in the later sense, i.e. a localized apostolic ruler of the Church, and this commends itself to most modern critics.[5] But though localized, his personal reputation and apostolic character made him a universal authority with Jewish Christians.[6] This is the historical basis for the 'archiepiscopal' and even papal dignity assigned to him in the Ebionite traditions.[7] When the hostility of the extreme Jewish nationalists led to his being put to death for 'breaking the law' just before the siege of Jerusalem, Symeon was elected to take his place, who, like

[1] ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23. 4: διαδέχεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων.

[2] Gal. i. 19, ii. 9; Acts xv.

[3] Gal. i. 18, 19; Acts xii. 17, xxi. 18.

[4] Acts xv. 13, 19, 20. See Lightfoot *Dissertation* p. 197.

[5] Clement of Alexandria (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 1. 3) says: 'Peter and James and John, after the assumption of the Saviour, though even the Lord had assigned them special honour, did not claim distinction, but elected James the Just bishop of Jerusalem.' 'As early as the middle of the second century,' says Dr. Lightfoot (p. 208), 'all parties concur in representing him as a bishop in the strict sense of the term.' He refers to Hegesippus ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23, iv. 22, and to the Clementines, *Hom.* xi. 35, *Ep. Petr.* init., *Ep. Clem.* init., *Recogn.* i. 43, 68, 73, etc.: of course the Clementine literature is not now dated so early (see p. 110 n.[2] *supra*), but the evidence of Hegesippus amply justifies the statement. Lightfoot himself concurs: James 'can claim to be regarded as a bishop' (p. 197). James gave, says Mr. Simcox (*Early Ch. Hist.* p. 50), 'it is scarcely inaccurate to say the first example of a diocesan bishop.' Cf. Johannes Müller *Verfassung der christl. Kirche*, p. 12.

[6] Gal. ii. 11-14 illustrates St. James' influence, however little those who 'came from' him acted as he would have had them act; cf. the opening of his own epistle. Hegesippus gives a sacerdotal colour to his office; see Harnack *Expositor*, May 1887, p. 327. He was held in high regard amongst non-Christian Jews, Josephus *Ant. Jud.* xx. 9. 1; and was known from the protection given by his constant intercessions as the περιοχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ, Hegesippus ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23; cf. Simcox *op. cit.* p. 123.

[7] *Recogn.* i. 73 'archbishop,' and *Ep. Clem. ad Iac.* init. 'bishop of bishops.' He exercises a quasi-papal authority over Peter; *Ep. Clem.* 1, *Recogn.* i. 17, 72.

James, was a relative of Jesus Christ. Hegesippus whom Eusebius speaks of as 'having been born in the time of the first succession from the Apostles,' apparently recorded his election by the Apostles themselves,[1] and certainly distinctly identifies his office with that of James and calls it a bishopric. He also mentions that there was a disappointed rival for the see called Thebuthis, who subsequently raised a schism and 'made a beginning of corrupting the virgin purity of the Church' with false doctrines. No one apparently supposes that the Jerusalem episcopate from this date was not continuous.[2] It is plain then that here at any rate the episcopal office was not only developed under apostolic patronage, but was in direct continuity with the apostolate, as

[1] Eusebius says, iii. 11: 'After the martyrdom of James and the taking of Jerusalem which immediately ensued, it is recorded (λόγος κατέχει) that those of the Apostles and of the Lord's disciples who were still alive came together from all parts with those who were related to our Lord; for of them also there were still several alive; and that they all held conference together as to whom they ought to select as worthy to succeed to James (τῆς Ἰακώβου διαδοχῆς ἄξιον). And that they all with one mind approved of Symeon the son of Clopas . . . as worthy of the throne of the community (παροικία) there, who was a cousin as they say of the Saviour. For Hegesippus relates that Clopas was a brother of Joseph.' The authority for this meeting may fairly, as Rothe maintains and Dr. Lightfoot admits, be assigned to Hegesippus: see the references to him ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 32. 1, 2, iv. 22. 4, and cf. Lightfoot *Dissertation* pp. 202, 208.

The question arises—granted this meeting historical, as it well may be—can it be supposed that it not only elected a bishop of Jerusalem but also issued a general decree for the establishment of episcopacy? Such a 'second apostolic council' formed the basis for the supposed apostolic legislation of the *Apostolic Constitutions* in the argument of those scholars of older times who accepted them as genuine, and the establishment of 'monepiscopacy' seems to be assigned to it by Ambrosiaster *in Eph.* iv. 12 ('prospiciente concilio'). Jerome probably has the same meaning when he assigns the establishment of episcopacy to a formal 'decretum,' apparently of the Apostles (see *in Tit.* i. 5). Besides this Rothe (*Anfänge* pp. 351-392) quotes for such a council the expression of Ignatius, τὰ διατάγματα τῶν ἀποστόλων (*ad. Trall.* 7), and the expression of the second of Pfaff's fragments, attributed to Irenaeus, αἱ δεύτεραι τῶν ἀποστόλων διατάξεις. He also thinks that the ambiguous language of Clement's letter (c. 44) supports the same view. He holds that it was on this occasion that the Apostles so distributed the work amongst them as that Asia, according to a tradition mentioned by Origen (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 1. 1), 'was assigned to John.' This evidence is discussed fully by Dr. Lightfoot *Dissertation* p. 204 f., and most people will agree with him that it affords a very insecure basis for the idea of a formal second council of the Apostles legislating for the establishment of episcopacy. The Pfaffian fragments of Irenaeus are now known to be forgeries.

[2] Eusebius' list of subsequent bishops of Jerusalem (*H. E.* iv. 5. 3) is not apparently derived from Hegesippus, and is not necessarily trustworthy in details. See Lightfoot *op. cit.* p. 209 n.[2].

represented by James, who, though not one of the Twelve, ranked and acted with them: and whether the presbyters at Jerusalem were ever known as 'bishops' or no, certainly the episcopal authority never belonged to them.

who at first were of the family of Christ:

But this earliest episcopate at Jerusalem had one unique feature. It was held by relatives of Christ. Symeon, our authority tells us, was chosen as 'the cousin of the Lord'; he was 'a descendant of David and a Christian.'[1] And we have other evidence of a tendency in the Jewish Christian Church of Palestine to prefer for ecclesiastical offices of authority those who could thus claim royal blood. Thus St. Jude's grandsons 'of the family of the Lord,' who were compelled (as Hegesippus tells us) to appear before Domitian in order to satisfy him that the empire was in no peril from their royal claims, when they were dismissed, became 'rulers of the churches,' or 'rulers of every church.'[2] This last expression (which seems to be Hegesippus' own) would probably indicate that, while there was a local episcopate at Jerusalem, there was a more general authority assigned, amongst the Jewish Christians of Palestine, to these members of the royal family of Christ—not, however, as the case of Symeon would assure us, by mere right of birth, but by due appointment. Chief authority in the Church was not yet, even among Jewish Christians, in all cases a localized or diocesan authority. And this is the evidence of the next document to be considered.

others of this family held a less localized authority.

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22. 4: ὃν προέθεντο πάντες, ὄντα ἀνέψιον τοῦ Κυρίου, δεύτερον: and iii. 32. 3.

[2] See ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 20. 6 and 32. 6. In the first case Eusebius, apparently quoting Hegesippus in the oratio obliqua, says that they ἡγήσασθαι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. In the second passage he quotes his actual words: προηγοῦνται πάσης ἐκκλησίας. This is therefore the more trustworthy expression. Dr. Hatch says (*B. L.*[2] p. 89) they 'presided in other Churches'; but Hegesippus seems to give them a more general authority.

II

II. The *Didache*.

The *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων) or, as it was perhaps originally called, the *Teaching of the Apostles*,[1] is a document which we may assume to belong probably to the first or the early part of the second century, and to have been composed by a Jewish Christian for a Christian community also Jewish in tone. There are reasons for attributing it to some remote district of Syria or Palestine, and in the fourth century it was taken as the basis of the seventh book of the Syrian *Apostolic Constitutions*: but it was also apparently exploited by two earlier documents in the third century, the Syrian *Didascalia* and the Egyptian *Apostolic Church Order*, and some scholars have looked to Egypt for its place of origin.[2] The theology which it represents is of a very inadequate nature, when compared with the teaching of the New Testament, and suggests in fact nothing so much as the condition of belief of those Hebrew Christians to whom the Epistle to the Hebrews was directed, in order to lift them out of the stage of rudimentary knowledge in which they were into some more adequate conceptions of the person of Christ, of His priesthood and mediation in the Church. It will cause no surprise that there should have existed somewhere about the year 100 A.D. a community of

Its general character.

[1] See Dr. Warfield *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1886, p. 110.

[2] Since its publication in 1883 the *Didache* has been, as Dr. Bigg calls it, 'the spoilt child of criticism,' and has been allowed to overshadow documents of much greater weight: Dr. Wotherspoon *The Ministry in the Church in relation to prophecy and spiritual gifts* (1916), chapters i. and ii., describes clearly and accounts for this tendency. From such overestimate of the document there has latterly been a reaction, which is represented by Dr. Bigg, Dr. Armitage Robinson, Dr. Wotherspoon, and Mr. Edmundson: see further App. note L, p. 367. For my own part I adhere to my former opinion of the early date of the *Didache* against these last-named scholars. But I have come to feel very strongly that both our ignorance of the circumstances of its origin and its own internal characteristics force us to make a very guarded use of it as an authority.

Jewish Christians with very imperfect doctrinal instruction, perhaps in a district remote from any centre of apostolic influence; and, though we shall not look to a writing emanating from amongst them for much light on Christian theology, we shall look with great interest to their form of church organization.

Its Church organization;

In the *Didache* then we are presented with a form of Church ministry which ought not to perplex any one acquainted with the Acts of the Apostles. We

local bishops and deacons,

have as local officers bishops and deacons, who are elected specially with a view to the conduct of worship in the community.[1] But, as in the apostolic church, these local officers are not the chief figures

with apostles, prophets, and teachers over them.

in the organization. Over them are 'apostles,' 'prophets,' and 'teachers,' who exercise a ministry not yet localized in any particular church.[2] The apostles are not indeed the Twelve; they correspond to what we should suppose is meant by the 'evangelists' of the New Testament; they are 'ambulatory' messengers of the Gospel,[3] and are almost identified with the prophets,[4] who are better defined figures than either apostles or teachers. These representatives of the Church at large, when they visit a community of Christians, are first of all to be tested by the standard of right teaching and of moral character.[5] The true apostle is to be distinguished

[1] xv. 1: χειροτονήσατε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους. This οὖν connects the election of the officers with c. xiv about the Sunday celebration of the 'pure sacrifice.' It will be noticed that nothing is said about the bishop in the passage (xiii. 3, 4) about firstfruits. We should not, however, be right in assuming that the bishop had nothing to do with these, any more than in concluding from c. vii. that the bishop had nothing to do with baptizing. The community in fact is addressed as a whole. They are directed to baptize, to fast, to give alms, to pray, to come together on the Lord's Day and confess their sins and celebrate their thank-offering, and then, with a view to the due performance of all these functions, they are directed to elect for themselves bishops and deacons.

[2] xi. 3, xiii. 2.

[3] They are perhaps like the 'apostles' of Rom. xvi. 7, Andronicus and Junias.

[4] The apostle who stays in a church more than two days is called a 'false prophet' (xi. 5); again (xi. 6) if he ask for money, he is a 'false prophet.'

[5] c. xi.

by the absence of any selfish motive; any sign of an inclination to fasten himself upon a church or to abandon the holy poverty of his vocation is to stamp him as a false prophet. The prophet too is to be tested by his character and conformity to the truth which he teaches, but when once he has been approved, his inspired utterances are not to be subjected to any criticism. This would be a sin which cannot be forgiven. He is to be listened to with reverent acceptance and allowed the freedom, which the old prophets had, to perform exceptional acts 'for a sign' or in a mystery.[1] He has freedom also to give thanks in the eucharistic celebration without the restriction of any set form;[2] and receives the firstfruits of all the produce of the community, because the prophets are the Christian 'high-priests.'[3] Clearly then these prophets, with the apostles and teachers, occupy the first rank in the church ministry: but, as we saw reason in the apostolic age to believe that the local 'clergy' shared fundamentally the same spiritual ministry as the apostles, only in a subordinate grade, so here we have it specified that the bishops and deacons exercise the same ministry as the prophets and teachers, and are therefore not to be 'overlooked.'[4]

So far then the indications of this document suggest a state of church government closely akin to what we should suppose would have existed in

[1] **xi.** 11. I do not wish to express any certainty about the meaning of these words; see Taylor *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* pp. 82-92.

[2] **x.** 7: τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν.

[3] xiii. 3. But ver. 4: 'if you have no prophet, give to the poor.' It is probably implied that the prophet will himself, when he is present, minister to the wants of the poor. He could not take the firstfruits for himself only without coming under the category of a 'false prophet.'

[4] Chapter **xv**, after providing for the election of fit persons as bishops and deacons, ἀξίους τοῦ Κυρίου, ἄνδρας πραεῖς καὶ ἀφιλαργύρους καὶ ἀληθεῖς καὶ δεδοκιμασμένους, continues: ὑμῖν γὰρ λειτουργοῦσι καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων· μὴ οὖν ὑπερίδητε αὐτούς· αὐτοὶ γάρ εἰσιν οἱ τετιμημένοι ὑμῶν μετὰ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων. I shall remark further on this word τετιμημένοι in connexion with the Epistle of Clement, p. 277 n.

apostolic and subapostolic days in any community not under the direct supervision of the Twelve. There are bishops and deacons, and over them prophets and teachers and apostles in the sense of evangelists,—men belonging to a ministry as yet unlocalized, and, in the case of the prophets at least, inspired. But two points specially require notice.

The prophet

(1) by 'settling' would become a diocesan bishop:

(1) It is specified that the prophet has the right to 'settle' in any of the churches he visits.[1] It is just in this context that he is declared to be the proper recipient of all firstfruits as the 'high-priest' of the community. Can we doubt then that, in the event of this prophetic teacher taking up his permanent residence in any church, with his authority as an inspired man, with his free power of eucharistic celebration, and with this 'high-priestly' dignity, he would have become, by whatever name he was called, the bishop of the community in the later sense? As then we have in St. James the first instance of a member of the apostolic ministry localized in a single church, so the *Teaching* seems to give us an indication that the settling of prophets would have been at least one way in which the transition was effected from the apostolic ministry to that of the later Church. What in fact was Polycarp of Smyrna, or Ignatius of Antioch, but a prophet who had become a bishop?[2] Thus the *Teaching* gives no countenance to the idea that in the region which it represents the 'bishops' (i.e. presbyters) and deacons would ever have held the place of chief authority in the Church.

(2) must have before held the power of laying-on hands.

(2) The community in the *Teaching* are exhorted to elect their bishops and deacons, just as the

[1] xiii. 1: *πᾶς δὲ προφήτης ἀληθινός, θέλων καθῆσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἄξιός ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.*

[2] Ignatius claims the gift of prophecy: *ad Philad.* 7. For Polycarp, see *Mart. Polyc.* 16: 'having been an apostolic and prophetic teacher, bishop of the holy Church in Smyrna,' and cf. c. 5, where he foresees his own martyrdom by means of a vision. On 'teachers' becoming bishops, see Kühl *Gemeindeord.* p. 131.

community elected 'the seven' in the Acts, or as even the smallest communities elected their bishop according to the *Apostolic Church Order*, or as the community elected its bishop and its deacons according to the *Church Order* of Hippolytus. Election was in fact after the age of the Apostles the predominant, if not the universal, method of choice. It did not, in any of the parallels just cited, exclude an element of control over the choice or ordination from outside by the laying-on of hands. Are we then to suppose that, because ordination is not mentioned in the *Teaching*, it is not implied? Some modern critics do in fact show a tendency to exalt the *Didache* in this respect as a source of evidence over the Pastoral Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles; and undoubtedly, if we were to take this anonymous writing of very ambiguous doctrinal character and exalt it as a criterion of what early Christianity meant over writings whose genuineness and apostolic authority there is no good reason to doubt, we might see grounds for believing that the subapostolic Church rated not only church orders, but also baptism and the eucharist at a very low estimate. Believing, however, the Pastoral Epistles and the Acts to be genuine documents, we naturally prefer to look at the *Didache* in the light of our other evidence as to apostolic practice and injunction. The question we ask is this: Is the evidence of the *Didache* incompatible with the evidence about ordination which we derive from apostolic sources? The answer is certainly in the negative. The *Didache* is silent about ordination, but it is silent also about all 'laying-on of hands.' Yet we know that in the mind of the early Church, and especially of its Jewish members, there was closely associated with the doctrine of baptisms that of the laying-on of hands.[1] The silence of the *Didache*

[1] See esp. Heb. vi. 2.

about ordination then, like other instances of silence, proves too much, if it is to be taken as equivalent to ignorance. It can be accounted for easily enough on a moment's consideration of one quite crucial fact. The *Didache* is a manual of directions for the local church. It does not presume to dictate to the prophets :[1] while forms of prayer are provided for the local ministers, the prophets are not bound by them. It says, therefore, nothing about the functions which do not belong to the local church with the local officers. Now all the evidence of the apostolic documents leads us to believe that the function of the laying-on of hands did not belong to the local officers, but to apostles and apostolic legates and also, as appeared, to certain prophets and teachers, the associates of apostles. As, therefore, we find the prophets in the *Didache* performing that 'liturgy' which is assigned to them also in the Acts,[2] what is more reasonable than to suppose that to them would have belonged as well that 'laying-on of hands' which in the same passage of the Acts is also assigned to them? We may well believe then that in the communities represented by the *Didache*, the bishops and deacons would have been elected by the whole body but ordained with laying-on of hands by some one of the prophetic 'high-priests' on their occasional visits.

In what has been said above we have been treating these 'apostles' and 'prophets' with all respect, as if they were of the same order of men as Barnabas and Silas, Timothy and Titus, only a generation or two later in date. But in fact the atmosphere of the *Didache* suggests suspicion. It appears to be as likely as not that their conduct will prove them to be 'false prophets': the chapters which describe them are redolent of the idea of fraud. It is almost impossible to believe that their contemporaries Ignatius

[1] x. 7, xi. 7, 11. [2] Acts xiii. 2.

and Clement would have recognised them as quasi-apostolic men. We are disposed, therefore, to think that in these ambiguous persons we have to do with the circulating missionaries of some out of the way group of Judaic churches, which were not merely uninstructed in their doctrine but had also fallen out of the fellowship of the apostolic churches; and that they were as questionable in authority as they often were in character. Nevertheless, the type of organization represented in the *Didache* remains highly interesting, because, even if the particular specimen must be regarded as debased, it illustrates as no other document does a condition of things which may have been not uncommon in the subapostolic period.

Cf. the ministry of Eusebius' evangelists.

The picture which is here given us of churches in the subapostolic age still governed by a local body of bishops,[1] while the higher authority in the word and sacraments remained with men who exercised an 'ambulatory' ministry, may be compared with the picture that Eusebius draws of the activity of evangelists in immediate succession to the Apostles. He describes how they went among the heathen, laying the foundations of the faith in unfamiliar places, and appointing others as pastors to whom they entrusted 'the husbandry' of those just brought within the pale, while they themselves went forth into new fields; how they had still many extraordinary powers working in them; and how it would be 'impossible for him to enumerate by name all those who in the first succession to the Apostles became pastors or evangelists in the churches over the whole world.'[2] We have only to suppose that these missionaries with their miraculous gifts not only founded churches but also for a time, like the

[1] Who are of course equivalent to presbyters though they are not called by the latter name. See App. Note K, p. 362.

[2] Euseb. iii. 37. 1-4. These evangelists are described as *τὴν πρώτην τάξιν τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐπέχοντες διαδοχῆς.*

Apostles to whom they succeeded, supervised them on occasional visits, and we have a picture, with merely the substitution of the title evangelist, very like that which the *Didache* presents. And it must not be forgotten that the earliest recorded traditions of the Syriac Church pointed back not, like those of Asia and of the West, to twelve Apostles, but to seventy-two, as having founded the successions of the priesthood in their communities.[1]

Prophets cease, as such, to hold the ministry.

It only remains to add that the *Didache* is the only document outside the New Testament which presents us with prophets exercising any ministerial function as such. It is true that later we have bishops like Ignatius and Polycarp who in fact are prophets—but they exercise their functions not as prophets but as bishops. The power of prophecy had not died out when Hermas saw his visions, or when Irenaeus wrote against heresies, or when Ammia and Quadratus prophesied ;[2] but the prophets held no official rank. So far as they had in early times been among the chief ministers and teachers of the Church, their 'high-priestly' functions and their teaching 'chair' passed to the bishops.[3]

[1] See above pp. 112 n., 198 n.[3].

[2] Iren. II. xxxii. 4, v. vi. 1, Euseb. v. 17. 3. See App. Note H, p. 349.

[3] The high-priesthood ascribed by Hippolytus to the bishops seems, in the important passage from the preface to the *Ref. Omn. Haer.* quoted at the end of App. Note G, p. 348 below (but see his ordination prayer on p. 133) to be specially connected with *teaching authority*: he speaks of a 'grace of high-priesthood and teaching' which the bishops hold in succession to the Apostles. So Polycrates describes St. John as a 'priest, wearing the mitre, and witness and teacher' (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 31. 3). So again the *καθέδρα* of the bishops was first of all the chair of the teacher. Thus in Irenaeus the office of the bishop is conceived of primarily as carrying with it the 'charisma veritatis certum' (IV. xxvi. 2), and this coincides with Hegesippus' view of the episcopal succession. And in the Clementines (*Ep. Clem. ad Iac.* 2) St. Peter says: Κλήμεντα τοῦτον ἐπίσκοπον ὑμῖν χειροτονῶ, ᾧ τὴν ἐμὴν τῶν λόγων πιστεύω *καθέδραν*. It is also noticeable that the right of extempore eucharist seems to have passed to the bishop, as in Justin Martyr *Apol.* i. 67 ; cf. *Did.* x. 7.

The attempt of Harnack, *Die Quellen der sogenannten apostolischen Kirchenordnung* (*Texte und Untersuchungen* Band ii. Heft 5, 1886) p. 57, to see in the office of reader a continuation in some sense of the prophetic office rests on no adequate grounds. No doubt at a time in which illiterate bishops were contemplated (as in the *Apostolic Church Order* 16 ; *Apostolic Constitutions*, repeated from the *Didascalia*, ii. 1. 2), the readers held an office of considerable importance, so that it is hardly surprising that in

If we ask the question, how these 'apostles' and 'prophets' of the *Didache* were appointed to their office, we cannot obtain an answer. We do not know exactly what were the ideas of the community in which they circulated. Even in the case of their prototypes in the New Testament we were not able clearly to ascertain whether the possession of acknowledged supernatural gifts was ever allowed to be a substitute for 'official' ordination. We were led to believe rather that the laying-on of apostolic hands would have given formal recognition to the call and authority which the divine *charisma* had already made evident. But the gift of prophecy may be easily simulated. And the prophets of the *Didache* at least afford us evidence that the continuity of the Church tradition could not have been allowed to rest upon prophets, nor an ambulatory prophetic ministry to become permanent in the Church, without widespread disorder.[1] As it is, we have evidence that the transition to the localized episcopate was in great part effected by the last survivors of the Twelve Apostles.

Apost. Ch. Order 19 the reader ranks above the deacons and is said to 'exercise the position of an evangelist.' But when the prayer for the ordination of a reader in *Apost. Const.* viii. 22. 3 invokes upon him the 'prophetic spirit,' or when (*ib.* ii. 28. 5) it is laid down that the reader is to receive 'one portion in honour of the prophets,' there cannot be any real doubt that it is the Old Testament prophets who are in the writer's mind: it is to be noted that in each of the two passages the prophetic reference is an insertion of the author of the *Constitutions*, and is absent from the earlier document (in one case the *Didascalia*, in the other the *Church Order* of Hippolytus) which served him for the basis of his own work. So again when the western writers on church offices, from Isidore down into the later middle ages, regard the reader's office as a continuation of that of the prophet, the context makes it abundantly clear that they are thinking of the Old Testament: Isidore *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 11 (Hittorp p. 23 [ed. 1591 p. 20]) 'lectorum ordo formam et initium a prophetis accepit,' repeated by Rabanus Maurus *de Inst. Cler.* i. 11 (*op. cit.* p. 317 [269]) and by (pseudo-) Albinus Flaccus *de Div. Off.* (*op. cit.* p. 70 [60]).

[1] The same suggestion of spiritual expediency would have promoted the transition from the state of things which we find in the *Didache* to that which we find in Ignatius' letters, which in a later age led to the drawing tight of diocesan restrictions: see above p. 149 n.[3] on the wandering bishops from Ireland and elsewhere. This wandering ministry gave every opportunity for imposture, and we ought not perhaps to be surprised to find a similar danger and similar abuses in the subapostolic age. As to the bearing of such dangerous periods on the security of the apostolic succession, enough perhaps was said in the second chapter, pp. 93, 94.

III

III. St. John institutes the diocesan episcopate,

About the time when the prophets and teachers of whom the *Didache* speaks were going on their journeys among the churches which acknowledged them, St. John was living at Ephesus; and Polycrates, who was bishop there within the second century, speaks of him 'who lay upon the Lord's breast' as having become 'a priest, wearing the mitre, and witness and teacher' before he fell asleep in Ephesus.[1] What then was the nature of St. John's activity during this last period of his life? A tradition which cannot be set aside connects with his name not only the writing of the fourth Gospel but also the establishment of episcopacy in its later sense. 'Listen,' says Clement of Alexandria, 'to a legend, which is no legend but very history, which has been handed down and preserved about John the Apostle. When on the death of the tyrant he returned from the isle of Patmos to Ephesus, he used to go away when he was summoned to the neighbouring districts as well, in some places to establish bishops, in others to organize whole churches, in others to ordain to the clergy some one of those indicated by the Spirit.'[2] The reference here is to bishops in the later sense: and Clement means that St. John ordained one bishop in each place, for the history which he goes on to narrate turns on the conduct of one of those appointed bishops who 'presided over' a certain city, which St. John visited once and again on

[1] ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 31. 3 ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκὼς καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος.

[2] *Quis Dives* 42. These last words vividly recall the apostolic age, cf. 1 Tim. i. 18, Acts xiii. 2. They 'seem to convince us that St. Clement reproduces the usage [of the apostolic age] faithfully' (Simcox *Early Ch. Hist.* p. 183). See Lightfoot *Ignatius* i. 380 on Clement's special means of knowledge through his 'Ionian' teacher.

occasions of necessity.[1] Here then we have St. John organizing episcopacy in the district about Ephesus. This testimony is confirmed by Tertullian: 'We have also,' he says, 'the churches who have John for their teacher. For the series of bishops [of the churches of Asia] if taken back to its origin will be found to rest upon his authorization.'[2] So, earlier maybe than Tertullian, the author of the Muratorian fragment speaks of St. John as urged to write his Gospel by 'his fellow-disciples and bishops.' Once again Irenaeus, who represented all the traditions of Asia, who had been Polycarp's disciple 'in his first youth' and kept up so vivid a memory of those early days, tells us that his master 'was not only made a disciple by apostles and held converse with many who had seen the Lord, but was also by apostles established in Asia as bishop in the church of Smyrna.'[3] In the term 'apostles' Irenaeus certainly means to include St. John. Here is then a great body of testimony connecting the episcopacy of the churches of Asia with St. John. It suggests strongly that St. John regarded it as his apostolic function to perpetuate a church ministry.

with other surviving Apostles

And in this last period of the apostolic ministry we must not isolate St. John. Irenaeus, as cited above, speaks of Polycarp as instituted by *apostles*. Ignatius speaks of episcopacy as the ordinance of *the Apostles*. 'When,' Dr. Lightfoot says, 'after the

[1] Clement calls this bishop also ὁ πρεσβύτερος, but perhaps in its natural sense, as he calls him ὁ πρεσβύτης later on. However, we have seen already that the word πρεσβύτερος was used to include bishops by Clement himself (p. 116 n.[2] *supra*) and by Irenaeus and later writers (pp. 102 n.[2], 219 n.).

[2] *adv. Marc.* iv. 5. Later, however, the Asiatic Church received Timothy as the first bishop of Ephesus, i.e. they carried back the succession behind John: in the eleventh session of the council of Chalcedon Leontius, bishop of Magnesia, reckons 'twenty-seven bishops from St. Timothy,' see Labbe-Coleti *Concil.* iv. col. 1620. And the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii. 46. 7) give as the first bishops 'Timothy ordained by Paul, and John by me John.' But this is no case of continuous tradition: the later view is derived direct from a study of New Testament material.

[3] Iren. III. iii. 4, quoted in Euseb. *H.E.* iv. 14. Cf. Tertull. *de Praescr.* 32: 'Smyrnaeorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Ioanne collocatum refert.'

destruction of Jerusalem St. John fixed his abode at Ephesus, it would appear that not a few of the oldest surviving members of the Palestinian Church accompanied him into "Asia," which henceforward became the headquarters of apostolic authority. In this body of emigrants Andrew and Philip among the twelve,[1] Aristion and John the presbyter among other personal disciples of the Lord, are especially mentioned.' 'A lifelong friendship would naturally draw Philip the Apostle of Bethsaida after John, as it also drew Andrew. And, when we turn to St. John's Gospel, we can hardly resist the impression that incidents relative to Andrew and Philip had a special interest, not only for the writer of the Gospel, but also for his hearers. Moreover the Apostles Andrew and Philip appear in this Gospel as inseparable companions.'[2] There is then reason to connect the establishment of Asiatic episcopacy with the combined action of several of the Apostles.

Ignatius' testimony.

Even, however, if we had not such direct testimony as has just been recorded to this organization of episcopacy by the Apostles who survived the destruction of Jerusalem,[3] the claim which Ignatius makes for episcopacy in the beginning of the second century would force us to postulate it. In passing to the consideration of the evidence which his letters afford for the history of the ministry, we cannot but congratulate ourselves that now for the third time in the history of literary controversy their genuineness has been vindicated by an English scholar. It is

[1] Andrew is mentioned in the *Muratorian Canon* among the 'condiscipuli' of St. John who urged him to write his Gospel. Philip is mentioned by Polycrates ap. Euseb. *H.E.* iii. 31. 3: 'Philip, of the number of the twelve apostles, who sleeps in Hierapolis with two daughters, who grew old in virginity, while his other daughter, having lived (πολιτευσαμένη) in the Holy Ghost, sleeps in Ephesus.' Dr. Lightfoot's argument that this Philip was really the Apostle and not the evangelist (*Colossians* p. 45 n.[3]) is convincing.

[2] *Colossians*, pp. 44-45, and 45 n.[3].

[3] It may well be considered that up to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem—that 'end of the age' for the Jewish Church—all ecclesiastical arrangements had a provisional character.

perhaps hardly too much to say that Dr. Lightfoot at last brought the long controversy to an end.[1]

Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, appears as a condemned prisoner moving by a route through Asia to his death at Rome, in the custody of a maniple of ten soldiers,

[1] Since the revival of learning, when scholars first began to perceive that the mediaeval 'Ignatian letters' were not the same as those quoted by the Fathers, down to the present time the writings of Ignatius have been a field for controversy constantly renewed. The decision of the controversy, at least for the time, has (as I have said in the text) thrice been due to English scholars. First in 1644 the critical insight and genius of Ussher led to the recovery, though only in Latin, of the seven shorter letters in the form now recognised as genuine, and banished for ever their mediaeval—interpolated or spurious—representatives. Next, when after the appearance in 1646 of the Greek text (of six out of the seven letters) the presbyterians, especially the French presbyterians, represented by Daillé (1666), were alarmed at the witness of the letters of Ignatius in favour of the cause of episcopacy and did their best to prove them spurious, the great Bishop Pearson wrote his *Vindiciae Ignatianae* (1672)—'incomparably,' Dr. Lightfoot says (*Ignatius* i. p. 320), 'the most valuable contribution to the subject which had hitherto appeared, with the single exception of Ussher's work,'—and on the main issue seemed almost to have put the question at rest for those open to conviction. But once again, after an interval of nearly two centuries, Cureton's publication in 1845 of Syriac abridgements or extracts (as we may now pronounce them to be) of some of the letters, which he maintained to be the only original form of them, stirred the embers of the old discussion, and the question was again rife which version, if any, represented the real Ignatius; and now once more the vindication of the genuineness of the 'shorter Greek' letters has fallen to an English scholar, Dr. Lightfoot, the prince, we may be proud to call him, of recent historical critics in the department of church history. Dr. Lightfoot did not indeed stand alone in his work of renewed vindication. Zahn's *Ignatius von Antiochien*, which appeared in 1873, is described by Dr. Lightfoot himself (*op. cit.* p. 272) as 'quite the most important contribution to the solution of the Ignatian question which has appeared since Cureton's discovery,' and as having 'dealt a fatal blow at the claims of the Curetonian letters.' But the chief merit rests with the English scholar.

When Dr. Lightfoot's great work appeared (1885) Harnack at once greeted it as 'the most learned and careful (sorgfältigste) patristic monograph of the century,' and in common with almost all scholars was convinced by the array of historical, linguistic, and general evidence on behalf of the letters which Lightfoot produced. He spoke of their genuineness as 'certain,' and of the 'inner grounds for it' as 'overpowering' (*Expositor*, Jan. 1886, pp. 10, 15). At that time, however, while accepting Dr. Lightfoot's conclusion that Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, was the author of these letters, he disputed the position that Ignatius wrote these letters and suffered martyrdom in the time of Trajan. He wished to bring the letters down from A.D. 110-118 to some date probably after A.D. 130. The earlier date he then regarded as a 'mere possibility, which is highly improbable, because it is not supported by any word in the Epistles, and because it rests only upon a late and very problematic witness' (*Expositor*, March 1886, p. 192). As regards, however, (1) the internal witness to date, Dr. Lightfoot had certainly the advantage over Harnack in the discussion of the nature of the heresy which Ignatius is opposing. In the Epistles to the Ephesians, Trallians, and Smyrnaeans, a docetic heresy is in question, in the Epistle to the Philadelphians a Judaistic. But in the Epistle to the Magnesians, at least, we learn that these do not represent separate and distinct tendencies: the heresy there in question is Judaeo-docetic—a type of heresy which recalls that with which St. Paul contended at Colossae and Ephesus. And throughout the Epistles the same general terms are used in speaking of either heretical tendency. There are no signs

whom for their harshness he calls 'ten leopards.'[1] But his progress is converted into a sort of triumph. The churches hear where he can be seen, and at Smyrna deputations arrive from Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles, and join the flock of Polycarp in doing him honour. While he is at Smyrna he writes four of the extant letters—to the Ephesians, to the Magnesians, to the Trallians, and to the Romans. The other three were written from Troas, whither an Ephesian deacon had accompanied him, and were addressed to two churches through which he had just passed, Philadelphia and Smyrna, and to Smyrna's bishop, Polycarp. He crosses from Troas to Neapolis, and from Neapolis passes to Philippi, where he is again welcomed by the church and escorted on his way; and so he goes on towards Rome, and we lose sight of him.[2]

His qualifications as a witness.

Here then we have a very notable witness. He is a man who, though he loves to describe himself as 'only now beginning to be a disciple,' is probably old in years.[3] He would have been a boy at least when St. Paul wrote his great Epistles; he would have

of *two* movements which Ignatius was resisting. Harnack admitted that Lightfoot 'can appeal on behalf of [his position] to the consensus of most scholars of modern times.' See Lightfoot i. pp. 361-3; Harnack *l.c.* pp. 175-185. As regards (2) the external evidence, Harnack quite underrated the force of Origen's testimony to the early date. Origen quotes and mentions Ignatius the martyr as 'second bishop of Antioch after the blessed Peter, who fought with beasts in the persecution at Rome' (*hom.* vi. *in Luc.*). This must refer (see Lightfoot ii. p. 470) to the persecution under Trajan. On the whole we may accept the connexion of Ignatius' martyrdom with Trajan's reign with great confidence. And Harnack himself now substantially admits this. See his *Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur* (1897), p. 406: 'die Ignatiusbriefe und der Polykarpbrief sind echt, und sie sind in den letzten Jahren Trajan's verfasst (110-117) oder vielleicht einige Jahre später (117-125)'; and also his *Constitution and Law of the Church* (Williams and Norgate, 1910), p. 83, 'as early as about the year 115.'

[1] *ad Rom.* 5: δέκα λεοπάρδοις, ὅ ἐστι στρατιωτικὸν τάγμα· οἳ καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι χείρους γίνονται. [2] Lightfoot i. pp. 34-37.

[3] He writes to Polycarp 'in language which is most appropriate on the lips of an old man speaking to one who is many years his junior' (Lightfoot i. p. 425). Now Polycarp, if he had received his appointment in the church of Smyrna, as Irenaeus says, from apostles, must, even if ordained at thirty, have been in mature life in A.D. 110. A similar result is obtained by arguing back from the date of Polycarp's martyrdom—probably A.D. 156—at which time he had been eighty-six years a Christian (*Mart. Polyc.* 9): this would make him forty in A.D. 110.

been in full manhood when the last days came upon Jerusalem. If the traditions of his relation to St. John cannot be depended upon, at any rate we must admit that he can bear unexceptionable testimony to apostolic intentions, and, unlike some of the subapostolic witnesses, he is one who, to whatever age he had belonged, would have been remarkable for his character and powers. The doctrinal and ecclesiastical interest of his letters has sometimes led to the moral beauty and power which they exhibit being overlooked. They reveal a man on fire with love, filled with the Spirit, one whom it would be absurd to call a literalist, a formalist, or a mere lover of organization. In spite of his Italian name, he is a thorough oriental, with a mystical, meditative spirit, who sees things according to their inner forces and hidden powers—witness his sayings of intense conviction about the silent workings of God[1] and of holiness, his spiritual conception of Christianity and of the eucharistic gifts,[2] his perception of the sanctity of common life.[3] Again he is beyond question the greatest theologian among the 'apostolic fathers,' with his deep insight into the Incarnation as a principle, a fact, a doctrine, and with his power to hold in balance its great antithesis in all its applications—the antithesis of the spiritual and the material, of the Word made flesh.[4]

This man then is on his way to death. Time is passing away from him, and he has but few moments in which to give, as his last message to the churches, what he thinks of most urgent importance for them in view of that age of restless speculation and wild

[1] See *ad Eph.* 6, 15, 19, *ad Philad.* 1, *ad Magn.* 8, *ad Trall.* 4.

[2] Whatever external conditions church unity requires, its essence is an inward fact. God Himself is the inner principle of union; *ad Trall.* 11, *ad Magn.* 15. For the eucharistic gifts, see *ad Eph.* 20, cf. 5, *ad Trall.* 8, *ad Rom.* 7.

[3] *ad Eph.* 8: ἃ καὶ κατὰ σάρκα πράσσετε, ταῦτα πνευματικά ἐστιν.

[4] Cf. his constant balancing of σαρκικῶς and πνευματικῶς, *ad Eph.* 10, *ad Magn.* 1, 13, *ad Trall.* 12, *ad Smyrn.* 1, 12, *ad Polyc.* 2; cf. Lightfoot ii. p. 48.

imaginative idealism, the solvent forces of which they were just beginning to feel. Under these circumstances he applies himself to strengthening two great fortresses of the Church's life. The first is the Incarnation—as a fact in history, as a thing sacramentally perpetuated, as a principle to be meditated upon, formulated, and fought for.[1] The second is the Ministry—the visible organization of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, by which the Church, the home of God's redemption, is to be known, and by which it is made plain that the Christian religion is not a dream or a speculation but a manifested life, social, organized, and disciplined, under the authority of a divinely-given rule.

The claim he makes for the threefold ministry.

In his assertion of the prerogative of the threefold ministry Ignatius is almost violently emphatic, as may be seen from the following passages from his letters :[2]—

'It is therefore meet . . . that being perfectly joined together in one submission, submitting yourselves to your bishop and presbytery, ye may be sanctified in all things.'

'I was forward to exhort you, that ye run in harmony with the mind of God: for Jesus Christ also, our inseparable life, is the mind of the Father, even as the bishops that are settled in the farthest parts of the earth are in the mind of Jesus Christ. So then it becometh you to run in harmony with the mind of the bishop; which thing also ye do. For your honourable presbytery, which is worthy of God, is attuned to the bishop, even as its strings to a lyre.'

'Let no man be deceived. If any one be not within the precinct of the altar, he lacketh the bread [of God]. For, if the prayer of one and another hath so great force, how much more that of the bishop and of the whole Church. . . . Let us therefore be careful not to resist the bishop, that by our submission we may give ourselves to God. And in proportion as a man seeth that his bishop is silent, let him fear him the more. For every one whom the Master of the household sendeth

[1] The emphasis upon the physical fact of Christ's incarnation, birth, death, resurrection, as against Docetism, is of course constant (*ad Magn.* 11, *ad Trall.* 9, *ad Smyrn.* 1); see Lightfoot i. pp. 359, 360. For the close connexion of the Incarnation with the Eucharist, see *ad Smyrn.* 6. For Ignatius' tendency to formulate as a doctrine the antithesis involved in the Incarnation, see *ad Eph.* 7, *ad Polyc.* 3, cf. *ad Eph.* 20.

[2] From Dr. Lightfoot's translation.

to be steward over His own house, we ought so to receive as Him that sent him. Plainly therefore we ought to regard the bishop as the Lord Himself.'

'Assemble yourselves together in common, every one of you severally, man by man, in grace, in one faith and one Jesus Christ, who after the flesh was of David's race, who is Son of Man and Son of God, to the end that ye may obey the bishop and the presbytery without distraction of mind; breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote that we should not die.'[1]

'Forasmuch then as I was permitted to see you in the person of Damas your godly bishop, and your worthy presbyters Bassus and Apollonius and my fellow-servant the deacon Zotion, of whom I would fain have joy, for that he is subject to the bishop as unto the grace of God and to the presbytery as unto the law of Jesus Christ:—Yea, and it becometh you also not to presume upon the youth of your bishop, but according to the power of God the Father to render unto him all reverence, . . . yet not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ, even to the Bishop of all. . . . For a man does not so much deceive this bishop who is seen, as cheat that other who is invisible.'

'It is therefore meet that we not only be called Christians, but also be such; even as some persons have the bishop's name on their lips, but in everything act apart from him. Such men appear to me not to keep a good conscience, forasmuch as they do not assemble themselves together lawfully according to commandment.'

'Be ye zealous to do all things in godly concord, the bishop presiding after the likeness of God and the presbyters after the likeness of the council of the Apostles, with the deacons also who are most dear to me, having been entrusted with the diaconate of Jesus Christ.'

'As the Lord did nothing without the Father, [being united with Him], either by Himself or by the Apostles, so neither do ye anything without the bishop and the presbyters. And attempt not to think

---

[1] *ad Eph.* 2: πρέπον οὖν ἐστὶν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δοξάζειν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν δοξάσαντα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν μιᾷ ὑποταγῇ κατηρτισμένοι, ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, κατὰ πάντα ἦτε ἡγιασμένοι.

3, 4: προέλαβον παρακαλεῖν ὑμᾶς. ὅπως συντρέχητε τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ γὰρ Ἰ. Χ., τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν, τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ γνώμη, ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες ἐν Ἰ. Χ γνώμῃ εἰσίν. Ὅθεν πρέπει ὑμῖν συντρέχειν τῇ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου γνώμῃ, ὅπερ καὶ ποιεῖτε. τὸ γὰρ ἀξιονόμαστον ὑμῶν πρεσβυτέριον, τοῦ θεοῦ ἄξιον, οὕτως συνήρμοσται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς χορδαὶ κιθάρᾳ.

5, 6: μηδεὶς πλανάσθω· ἐὰν μή τις ᾖ ἐντὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, ὑστερεῖται τοῦ ἄρτου [τοῦ θεοῦ]· εἰ γὰρ ἑνὸς καὶ δευτέρου προσευχὴ τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ἔχει, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἡ τε τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας . . . σπουδάσωμεν οὖν μὴ ἀντιτάσσεσθαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἵνα ὦμεν θεοῦ ὑποτασσόμενοι. Καὶ ὅσον βλέπει τις σιγῶντα ἐπίσκοπον, πλειόνως αὐτὸν φοβείσθω· πάντα γὰρ ὃν πέμπει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης εἰς ἰδίαν οἰκονομίαν, οὕτως δεῖ ἡμᾶς αὐτὸν δέχεσθαι ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν πέμψαντα· τὸν οὖν ἐπίσκοπον δηλονότι ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν Κύριον δεῖ προσβλέπειν.

20: οἱ κατ' ἄνδρα κοινῇ πάντες ἐν χάριτι ἐξ ὀνόματος συνέρχεσθε ἐν μιᾷ πίστει καὶ ἐνὶ Ἰ. Χ. τῷ κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ γένους Δαυείδ, τῷ υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου καὶ υἱῷ θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ὑμᾶς τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ἀπερισπάστῳ διανοίᾳ· ἕνα ἄρτον κλῶντες, ὅ ἐστιν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν.

anything right for yourselves apart from others; but let there be one prayer in common, etc.'

'Do your diligence therefore that ye be confirmed in the ordinances of the Lord and of the Apostles, that ye may prosper in all things whatsoever ye do in flesh and spirit . . . in the Son and Father and in the Spirit, . . . with your revered bishop, and with the fitly wreathed spiritual circlet of your presbytery, and with the deacons who walk after God. Be obedient to the bishop and to one another, as Jesus Christ was to the Father [according to the flesh], and as the Apostles were to Christ and to the Father, that there may be union both of flesh and of spirit.'[1]

'When ye are obedient to the bishop as to Jesus Christ, it is evident to me that ye are living not after men but after Jesus Christ. . . . It is therefore necessary, even as your wont is, that ye should do nothing without the bishop; but be ye obedient also to the presbytery, as to the Apostles. . . . And those likewise who are deacons of the mysteries of Jesus Christ must please all men in all ways. For they are not deacons of meats and drinks but servants of the Church of God. It is right therefore that they should beware of blame as of fire. In like manner let all men respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the bishop as being a type of the Father and the presbyters as the council of God and as the college of Apostles. Apart from these there is not even the name of a Church.'

'This will surely be, if ye be not puffed up and if ye be inseparable from [God] Jesus Christ and from the bishop and from the ordinances of the Apostles. He that is within the sanctuary is clean; but he that

---

[1] *ad Magn.* 2, 3: Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἠξιώθην ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς διὰ Δαμᾶ τοῦ ἀξιοθέου ὑμῶν ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἀξίων Βάσσου καὶ Ἀπολλωνίου καὶ τοῦ συνδούλου μου διακόνου Ζωτίωνος, οὗ ἐγὼ ὀναίμην, ὅτι ὑποτάσσεται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς χάριτι θεοῦ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς νόμῳ Ἰ. Χ. Καὶ ὑμῖν δὲ πρέπει μὴ συγχρᾶσθαι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν θεοῦ πατρὸς πᾶσαν ἐντροπὴν αὐτῷ ἀπονέμειν, οὐκ αὐτῷ δέ, ἀλλὰ τῷ πατρὶ Ἰ. Χ. τῷ πάντων ἐπισκόπῳ . . . ἐπεὶ οὐχ ὅτι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τοῦτον τὸν βλεπόμενον πλανᾷ τις, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀόρατον παραλογίζεται.

4: Πρέπον οὖν ἐστὶν μὴ μόνον καλεῖσθαι Χριστιανοὺς ἀλλὰ καὶ εἶναι· ὥσπερ καί τινες ἐπίσκοπον μὲν καλοῦσιν, χωρὶς δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντα πράσσουσιν· οἱ τοιοῦτοι δὲ οὐκ εὐσυνείδητοί μοι εἶναι φαίνονται διὰ τὸ μὴ βεβαίως κατ' ἐντολὴν συναθροίζεσθαι.

6: ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ θεοῦ σπουδάζετε πάντα πράσσειν, προκαθημένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τύπον θεοῦ καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τύπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν διακόνων τῶν ἐμοὶ γλυκυτάτων, πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰ. Χ.

7: Ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἐποίησεν [ἡνωμένος ὤν], οὔτε δι' ἑαυτοῦ οὔτε διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων· οὕτως μηδὲ ὑμεῖς ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μηδὲν πράσσετε, μηδὲ πειράσητε εὔλογόν τι φαίνεσθαι ἰδίᾳ ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μία προσευχὴ κ.τ.λ.

13: Σπουδάζετε οὖν βεβαιωθῆναι ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἵνα πάντα ὅσα ποιεῖτε κατευοδωθῆτε σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι, πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ, ἐν υἱῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἐν πνεύματι, ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ ἐν τέλει, μετὰ τοῦ ἀξιοπρεπεστάτου ἐπισκόπου ὑμῶν καὶ ἀξιοπλόκου πνευματικοῦ στεφάνου τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν κατὰ θεὸν διακόνων. ὑποτάγητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ ἀλλήλοις, ὡς Ἰ. Χ. τῷ πατρὶ [κατὰ σάρκα] καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ Χ. καὶ τῷ πατρί, ἵνα ἕνωσις ᾖ σαρκική τε καὶ πνευματική

is without the sanctuary is not clean, that is, he that doeth aught without the bishop and presbytery and deacons, this man is not clean in his conscience.'

'Fare ye well in Jesus Christ, submitting yourselves to the bishop as to the commandment, and likewise also to the presbytery.'[1]

'For as many as are of God and of Jesus Christ, they are with the bishop; and as many as shall repent and enter into the unity of the Church, these also shall be of God. . . . Be not deceived, my brethren: if any man followeth one that maketh a schism, he doth not inherit the kingdom of God. If any man walketh in strange doctrine, he hath no fellowship with the passion. Be ye careful therefore to observe one eucharist: for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup unto union in His blood; there is one altar, as there is one bishop, together with the presbytery and the deacons my fellow-servants.'[2]

'Shun divisions, as the beginning of evils. Do ye all follow your bishop, as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and the presbytery as the Apostles; and to the deacons pay respect, as to God's commandment. Let no man do aught of things pertaining to the Church apart from the bishop. Let that be held a valid eucharist which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it. Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be; even as where Jesus may be, there is the universal Church. It is not lawful apart from the bishop either to baptize or to hold a love-feast; but whatsoever he shall approve, this is well-pleasing also to God; that everything which ye do may be sure and valid.'

'It is good to recognise God and the bishop. He that honoureth

---

[1] *ad Trall.* 2, 3: Ὅταν γὰρ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσησθε ὡς Ἰ. Χ., φαίνεσθέ μοι οὐ κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ζῶντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ Ἰ. Χ. . . . ἀναγκαῖον οὖν ἐστίν, ὥσπερ ποιεῖτε, ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν πράσσειν ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ' ὑποτάσσεσθε καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, ὡς [τοῖς] ἀποστόλοις Ἰ. Χ. . . . δεῖ δὲ καὶ τοὺς διακόνους ὄντας μυστηρίων Ἰ. Χ. κατὰ πάντα τρόπον πᾶσιν ἀρέσκειν· οὐ γὰρ βρωμάτων καὶ ποτῶν εἰσιν διάκονοι, ἀλλ' ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ὑπηρέται· δέον οὖν αὐτοὺς φυλάσσεσθαι τὰ ἐγκλήματα ὡς πῦρ. Ὁμοίως πάντες ἐντρεπέσθωσαν τοὺς διακόνους ὡς Ἰ. Χ., ὡς καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὄντα τύπον τοῦ πατρός, τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ὡς συνέδριον θεοῦ καὶ ὡς σύνδεσμον ἀποστόλων· χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται.

7: τοῦτο δὲ ἔσται ὑμῖν μὴ φυσιουμένοις καὶ οὖσιν ἀχωρίστοις [θεοῦ] Ἰ. Χ. καὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν διαταγμάτων τῶν ἀποστόλων. ὁ ἐντὸς θυσιαστηρίου ὢν καθαρός ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ ἐκτὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ὢν οὐ καθαρός ἐστιν· τουτέστιν, ὁ χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτερίου καὶ διακόνου πράσσων τι, οὗτος οὐ καθαρός ἐστιν τῇ συνειδήσει.

13: ἔρρωσθε ἐν Ἰ. Χ., ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς τῇ ἐντολῇ, ὁμοίως καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ.

[2] *ad Philad.* 3, 4: ὅσοι γὰρ θεοῦ εἰσιν καὶ Ἰ. Χ., οὗτοι μετὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰσίν· καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μετανοήσαντες ἔλθωσιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ οὗτοι θεοῦ ἔσονται . . . μὴ πλανᾶσθε, ἀδελφοί μου· εἴ τις σχίζοντι ἀκολουθεῖ, βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομεῖ· εἴ τις ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ γνώμῃ περιπατεῖ, οὗτος τῷ πάθει οὐ συγκατατίθεται. Σπουδάσατε οὖν μιᾷ εὐχαριστίᾳ χρῆσθαι· μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ., καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ· ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος, ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις, τοῖς συνδούλοις μου.

the bishop is honoured of God; he that doeth aught without the knowledge of the bishop rendereth service to the devil.'[1]

The ministry is

The following points in Ignatius' teaching about the ministry require to be emphasized :—

(1) of divine authority;

(1) He has an intensely clear perception that the 'mind of God' for man's salvation has expressed itself not in any mere doctrine but in a divinely instituted society with a divinely authorized hierarchy. This is the 'mind of God,' this is 'the commandment,' so clearly that he who would obey the commandment and run in harmony with the divine purpose must perforce have merged his individuality in the fellowship of the Church and submitted his wilfulness to her government.

(2) essentially threefold;

(2) He regards the authoritative hierarchy of the Church as essentially threefold — a ministry of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. It is not merely, as has been suggested, that he exhorts men to be, or to be more decidedly, members of the church organization which happens to have a ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons. He insists polemically that this particular form of ministry is essential to the existence of a church: 'without these three orders' (so Dr. Lightfoot renders his words) 'no church has a title to the name.'[2]

[1] *ad Smyrn.* 8: Τοὺς δὲ μερισμοὺς φεύγετε, ὡς ἀρχὴν κακῶν. πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς Ἰ. Χ. τῷ πατρί, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις· τοὺς δὲ διακόνους ἐντρέπεσθε ὡς θεοῦ ἐντολήν. μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ· ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω· ὥσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Ἰ. Χ., ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν· ἀλλ' ὃ ἂν ἐκεῖνος δοκιμάσῃ, τοῦτο καὶ τῷ θεῷ εὐάρεστον, ἵνα ἀσφαλὲς ᾖ καὶ βέβαιον πᾶν ὃ πράσσετε.

9: καλῶς ἔχει θεὸν καὶ ἐπίσκοπον εἰδέναι· ὁ τιμῶν ἐπίσκοπον ὑπὸ θεοῦ τετίμηται· ὁ λάθρα ἐπισκόπου τι πράσσων τῷ διαβόλῳ λατρεύει.

[2] *ad Trall.* 3 χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται, and see Lightfoot *in loc.* Cf. also Zahn *Ignat. von Antioch.* p. 300; 'was ohne die Träger des dreifachen Kirchenamtes ist, heisst nicht Kirche.' He, however, goes on: 'aber den Gegensatz bildet nicht eine Gemeinde, welche dieser Institute oder eines derselben entbehrt, sondern ein kirchliches Handeln, wie Abendmahlsfeier oder sonstige gottesdienstliche Versammlungen, welches ohne Wissen und Willen, ohne directe oder indirecte Leitung des an der Spitze stehenden Bischofs und der ihm untergeordneten Presbyter und Diakonen vor sich geht.' Cf. Lightfoot i. p. 382. It is quite true that Ignatius has

(3) undisputed;

(3) Ignatius' testimony presents us with the 'monarchical episcopate' as 'firmly rooted,' 'completely beyond dispute.'[1] We cannot doubt that he bases its authority on the '*ordinances of the Apostles*.'[2]

(4) universal in the Church.

(4) Besides regarding episcopacy as of the essence of a church and as of apostolic authority, he speaks of it as co-extensive with the Church, that is, as existing everywhere. He speaks of the bishops as *established in the farthest parts of the earth*.[3] He knows of no non-episcopal area. This of course is evidence to which it will be necessary to pay attention when we come to consider the state of the western churches, especially that of Philippi, through which he was to pass, and that of Rome, which he addresses in such high praise as 'enlightened through the will of Him who willed all things that are, . . . in flesh and in spirit united unto His every commandment.'[4]

(5) The episcopate represents the 'monarchy' of Christ.

(5) Lastly, it is of great importance to see what answer Ignatius suggests to the question whether the monarchical episcopate came into existence by

no 'presbyterian' form of government in view, but it seems to me beyond fair question that he insists upon episcopacy as the *only* church government, and would have refused to recognise any other.

It must be noticed that Ignatius claims prophetic gifts and as a prophet has received special communications on the subject of church order. He claims (*ad Philad.* 7) to have spoken with the voice of God: 'It was the preaching of the Spirit, who spake on this wise: "do nothing without the bishop; keep your flesh as a temple of God; cherish union; shun divisions; be imitators of Jesus Christ, as He Himself also was of His Father."'

[1] Harnack *Expositor*, Jan. 1886, p. 16. Lightfoot disposes of the notion that νεωτερικὴ τάξις (*ad Magn.* 3) refers to the episcopate as a 'newly instituted order.'

[2] *ad Trall.* 7: οὗσιν ἀχωρίστοις [θεοῦ] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν διαταγμάτων τῶν ἀποστόλων. 'The reference [of the last four words] is doubtless to the institution of episcopacy' (Lightfoot *in loc.*). Cf. *ad Trall.* 12, where he orders the church and presbyters to comfort their bishop to the honour of the Father and of Jesus Christ and of the Apostles. Kühl has no grounds for his attempt to make Ignatius struggle to promote a new ideal; see *Gemeindeord.* pp. 132, 133.

[3] *ad Eph.* 3 οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες; cf. *ad Rom.* 6 τὰ πέρατα τοῦ κόσμου. 'Ignatius would be contemplating regions as distant as Gaul on the one hand and Mesopotamia on the other' (Lightfoot *in loc.*). He ascribes equal catholicity to the Church and to the episcopate.

[4] *ad Rom.* inscr.; see also c. 4, where he specially speaks of the Roman church as having received commandments from the Apostles Peter and Paul, and cf. Lightfoot i. p. 357.

elevation out of the presbyterate, or whether it inherited functions which had belonged hitherto only to apostles and those who were fellow-workers with apostles or who subsequently had shared their authority. Now all the indications of Ignatius' letters seem to assure us that the latter is the true view. That is to say, the presbyters in the church of Asia, as in the churches of Palestine and Syria, never had held the office which Ignatius calls episcopal. They had indeed borne the name (which perhaps St. John's authority transferred to those whom he put in chief charge of the churches[1]) but they had never held the office. The reasons for this view are these.

Ignatius attributes to the bishops an authority *essentially monarchical.* He does not speak of them as succeeding to the Apostles, but he regards them as representing Christ or the Father, while the presbyters, the companions of the bishop, are like the circle of the Twelve round their Master.[2] Thus each church with its bishop and presbytery is like a little

[1] This transference of the title 'episcopus' need not surprise us. It will be noticed that St. Peter classes himself, though he is an apostle, among the presbyters (1 Peter v. 1; cf. Lightfoot *Dissertation* p. 198 on St. Paul's relation to the presbyterate at Corinth). Thus, when the 'vir apostolicus' like Timothy was put in charge of a church, he doubtless became a presbyter among presbyters, though he was their ruler, and would have been reckoned with them as holding the ἐπισκοπή. But, where there was a distinction of office and power, a distinction of names was desirable; and it was most natural that the localized representative of apostolic authority, like 'bishops' James and Symeon, should have the title 'episcopus' reserved to him (while the title presbyter remained common to all who sat on the raised bench of church rulers), for it is in itself much more applicable to a single president than to the members of a college. (It is perhaps just worth notice that the term ἐπισκοπή is first used—Acts i. 20—though with reference to the Psalm, for the apostolic office). The titles 'apostle,' 'evangelist,' 'teacher,' 'prophet,' were on the other hand, for different reasons, not suitable to describe the chief pastors of a particular Church. We have a parallel to this transference of a title from a lower to a higher use in the history of the term *imperator.*

[2] The comparison of the presbyters to the Apostles is the regular comparison in Ignatius. The comparisons for the bishop and deacons are more variable; see Lightfoot on *ad Trall.* 3. The bishop represents indifferently Christ or the Father: see *ad Magn.* 6, *ad Trall.* 2, 3 (cf. 13), *ad Smyrn.* 8. There are also vaguer phrases according to which the bishop represents 'the grace of God,' and the presbyters 'the law of Jesus Christ' (*ad Magn.* 2). The deacons in a sense represent Christ as ministering (*ad Magn.* 6, *ad Trall.* 3); cf. Lightfoot i. p. 382.

theocracy, in which the bishop represents the authority of God and is a fresh embodiment of that divine presence which was in the world when Christ moved about with His Apostles round Him. This appears to have been a Jewish-Christian way of representing the succession in the Church. We recall how Hegesippus spoke of James as 'receiving the Church in succession with the Apostles,' implying that he and the Apostles *succeeded to Christ*; so those who were of Christ's family were supposed to represent Him in Palestine as the King of the house of David; and so too in the third century the bishop ordained by Peter in the Clementines is given not only the chair of the Apostle but also 'the chair of Christ,'[1] and this way of conceiving the succession appears also in the *Didascalia*, and is copied from thence into the *Apostolic Constitutions*.[2] Thus, if the presbyters by this comparison represent the Apostles, they represent them as they were *before Christ's ascension*, not after it—as they were when Christ was among them. After that each one of the Apostles became in his turn a representative of Christ, and that in a sense which gave him an authority far greater than

Relation of this to the apostolic succession.

[1] *Ep. Clem.* 17, *Hom.* iii. 70; and twelve presbyters are instituted, i.e. the number of the Apostles (*Recogn.* iii. 66, vi. 15, xi. 36).

[2] *Didascalia*: 'The bishop presides over you as a type of God . . . let the presbyters be regarded by you as a type of the Apostles': 'Let the portion customary for the bishop be set aside, even if he be not present, in honour of Almighty God . . . the presbyters shall equally with the deacons have a double portion, for they too should be honoured like the Apostles as counsellors of the bishop and the crown of the Church.' *Apost. Const.* ii. 26. 4, 7; 28. 2, 4; repeats these prescriptions with some modification of the language. It will be seen (p. 321 n.[2]) that in the Maronite office for the ordination of bishops and in a passage of Ephraem Syrus the succession is traced from God on Mount Sinai, through Moses and Aaron, to John the Baptist, and so through Christ to His Apostles and the bishops: in each generation there have been persons who (more or less) represented God and His authority. This is a somewhat Judaistic way of conceiving the succession. It comes from emphasizing authority rather than grace; Ignatius, however, cannot in general be accused of any Judaism in his mode of representing Christ's relation to His Church. See esp. *ad Rom.* 3: 'For our God Jesus Christ, being in the Father, is the more plainly visible.'

It is to be noticed that Dr. Hatch in describing this theocratic conception of the episcopal office says (*B. L.*[2] p. 89): 'Upon this theory of ecclesiastical organization the existence of a president was a necessity; and the theory seems to go back to the very beginnings of the Christian societies.' I do not know how this admission is worked in with his general theory of the origin of church organization.

Ignatius would dare to claim for himself or any of his contemporaries.[1] In a sense, then, the Apostles according to Ignatius have no successors; in a sense, again, the presbyters in their relation to the bishop succeed to them in their relation to Christ when He was on earth; but in yet another sense the bishops alone succeed to that office of representing Christ and speaking with the authority of God which had been the special prerogative of the Apostles.

The authority of the episcopate never held by the presbyters.

Thus, though the bishops are conceived by Ignatius as representatives not of the Apostles but rather of Christ or God, they are clothed with that monarchical authority which had belonged to the Apostles but never to the presbyters: only the bishops are limited in the exercise of their authority to one church, whereas the apostolic office had been more general. Once again the office of the bishop in Ignatius is distinguished from the presbyterate, when he speaks of the 'youthful rank' of one who held it and bids his flock reverence him none the less, in words which recall St. Paul's exhortation to his apostolic legate to let no man despise his youth.[2] The office of presbyter, we know, was not yet divorced from the qualifications and associations of age.[3] The bishops then in Ignatius succeed to an authority which had been apostolic and had never belonged to the presbyters.[4]

[1] *ad Rom.* 4: οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν· ἐκεῖνοι ἀπόστολοι, ἐγὼ κατάκριτος. Cf. *ad Trall.* 3, *ad Philad.* 5. See further, on this idea of succession to Christ, Dr. Liddon in *A Father in Christ*[2] p. xxv. f.

[2] *ad Magn.* 3: 1 Tim. iv. 12.

[3] The πρεσβύτεροι are still put in contrast to νεώτεροι or νέοι by Polycarp *ad Phil.* 5, as well as by Clement *ad Cor.* 1. So in the *Apostolic Church Order*, cc. 16-18, there is no requirement of age for the bishop, but there is for the presbyters, c. 18 ἤδη κεχρονικότας ἐπὶ τῷ κόσμῳ. Cf. p. 277 n.

[4] Dr. Lightfoot emphasizes the absence of sacerdotalism in Ignatius, i. p. 381: 'There is not throughout these letters the slightest tinge of sacerdotal language in reference to the Christian ministry.' I think I have said enough on this subject already: see pp. 70-80. Ignatius' words—*ad Smyrn.* 8: 'Let that be held a valid eucharist which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it'—are hardly what is commonly called unsacerdotal. There is indeed a striking absence of the false sacerdotalism which identifies church office with spiritual nearness to

It falls in with this conclusion that Ignatius, when he alludes to his own 'church of Syria' after he has been carried off towards Rome, speaks of it to the Romans[1] as having God for its pastor in his place. 'Only Jesus Christ shall be its bishop and your love.' He speaks of it, that is to say, as a widowed church, not at all as if the remaining presbyters could supply the bishop's place.

Summary of results from Palestine, Syria, Asia.

We are now in a position to sum up the results of our investigation with regard to the Judaic churches and those of Syria and Asia. All the indications we have would lead to the belief that the chief authority of government, ministry, and ordination passed from the Apostles and those who ranked with them to the bishops of the period of Ignatius without ever having belonged to the presbyters. James, 'the first bishop,' is a man of apostolic rank and authority settled in Jerusalem, and his office devolved upon a line of bishops after him, who were in the church of Jerusalem what he had been, except so far as his position had depended upon his personal character and relation to our Lord. The *Didache* presents us with a chief ministry in the Church not yet localized, the holders of this Christian 'high-priesthood' being known as 'prophets' and associated with other evangelists known as 'apostles' or 'teachers.' The

God, see *ad Smyrn.* 6: τόπος μηδένα φυσιούτω· τὸ γὰρ ὅλον ἐστὶν πίστις καὶ ἀγάπη, ὧν οὐδὲν προκέκριται. A passage (*ad Philad.* 9), in which he contrasts the priests of the old covenant with 'the High-priest' of the new, may suggest a reason for his not using sacerdotal *terms* about the Christian ministry. The term 'priest' had still associations too Judaic to be admissible. In regard to the unseen Christ there was no danger of mistake, and the recognition of His High-priesthood guaranteed the sacerdotal character of His Church in the general sense. We may notice that Ignatius speaks of the bishops, presbyters, and deacons at Philadelphia as appointed in accordance with the mind of Jesus Christ and established by Him with the Holy Spirit in confirmation of their office; see *ad Philad.* inscr.

[1] *ad Rom.* 9. He says nothing about the provision of a successor. But he speaks of the nearest churches sending some of their bishops and others, presbyters and deacons, as ambassadors to Antioch after he had gone, *ad Philad.* 10. And we may presume that such bishops would have ordained as Ignatius' successor the man elected by the church of Antioch.

authority, however, of the survivors of the Twelve seems to have promoted a transition to a state of things in which we have a ruler-in-chief localized in each community, like Ignatius in Syria,[1] Polycarp at Smyrna, and the other bishops whom Ignatius' letters present to us. These rulers, though they bear a name transferred from the presbyterate, hold that office of representing the supreme authority of Christ and of the Father, which had belonged to James and his successors at Jerusalem, to prophets and teachers, and to apostolic legates, but never to the presbyters. There was not indeed such a localized ruler in every church in the age immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem; but there is no reason why we should not believe such a tradition as assigns to St. Peter the foundation of the episcopate at Antioch, i.e. there is no reason against believing that there was from the first a representative of apostolic authority localized at Antioch, or indeed at the other chief centres of Christian life. But, even if this and similar traditions present us with the facts somewhat idealized, as is the habit of tradition, at least they do not misrepresent the facts. It would certainly appear that the episcopal authority at Antioch and elsewhere was derived direct from that of 'apostles and prophets' and had never passed through the presbyterate. It was an authority which represents devolution from above and not delegation from below.

The West. Strong tradition in favour of the succession of bishops from the Apostles.

It will not have been forgotten with what strength of conviction the western traditions of the later half of the second century represent the authority of the episcopal successions then existing as derived from the Apostles. It is enough to recall the testimony

[1] Ignatius was known in church history as bishop of Antioch. But he speaks of himself as having been bishop 'of Syria' or 'of the church in Syria' (*ad Rom.* 2, 9), as if there were no other bishop there: see below p. 291 n.[1]. It is surprising to find Harnack (*Expansion* ii. 89) declaring that Ignatius was already 'metropolitan of Syria' with other bishops under him.

of Irenaeus, corroborated as it is by that of the somewhat earlier Hegesippus, as to the list of bishops of Rome, running back through Clement to Linus who was entrusted with the episcopate by the Apostles Peter and Paul after they had founded the church, and the assertion of Dionysius of Corinth (writing about A.D. 170) that his namesake the Areopagite had been the first to be entrusted with the episcopate at Athens.[1] The confidence of these immemorial traditions at this early date is at least very impressive. 'Episcopacy,' Dr. Lightfoot says, 'is so inseparably interwoven with all the traditions and beliefs of men like Irenaeus and Tertullian, that they betray no knowledge of a time when it was not. . . . Their silence [as to any controversy about it] suggests a strong negative presumption, that while every other point of doctrine or practice was eagerly canvassed, the form of Church government alone scarcely came under discussion.'[2]

Historical links:

We have then now to enquire how far this 'confidence of boasting' about the apostolic succession is justified by the indications which history gives us of the development of the ministry in the Churches of Europe between the period of apostolic presidency and the age of Dionysius and Irenaeus.

Historical links are afforded by three documents: the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, that of Polycarp to the Philippians, and the *Shepherd* of Hermas.

IV

IV. Epistle of Clement. The writer.

Clement, who is the real writer of the Epistle which commonly bears his name,[3] though he merges his

[1] Euseb. *H.E.* iv. 23: πρῶτος τῆς Ἀθήνησι παροικίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐγκεχείριστο.

[2] *Dissertation* p. 227. It should be noticed that the views of Ambrosiaster, Jerome, etc., as to the original government of the churches by equal presbyter-bishops and the subsequent creation of the monarchical episcopate, do not rest on tradition, except perhaps at Alexandria, but were simply based on exegetical grounds of New Testament interpretation like the views of later scholars.

[3] As Dionysius of Corinth first assures us.

personality in his church and writes as Jerome says 'ex persona ecclesiae Romanae,' is a very different man from the intense, abrupt, fervid Ignatius. But, though he writes in a very different tone, it is with the same general purpose as moved Ignatius—it is to uphold the authority of the church ministry against schismatic aggression. Whatever may have been his origin,[1] Clement is a thorough Roman in his respect for the principle of order, and he insists upon it with a strong yet gentle reasonableness, or (to quote a phrase which occurs twice in his letter) with an 'intense moderation.'[2]

In his theology Clement shows his true character as a harmonizer—both by holding together the teaching of St. John, St. Paul, and St. James, and by emphasizing the motives which Christian theology suggests making for self-suppression and peace.[3] But there is not much of theological insistence in Clement's letter, for he has no pressing heresy to combat.[4] His mind's eye is constantly fixed in admiration on the divine order and harmony in things and on the duty which lies upon all men of respecting this principle in the several departments of life. For the order of civil government he has a Roman's veneration, and (though his church was still passing through the fiery furnace of Domitian's persecution) he welcomes the duty upon which St. Paul insists of praying for kings and all who are in authority, and gives the Roman state the full support of his church's intercessions.[5] He emphasizes again that the strength of the army depends

[1] Lightfoot thinks he was a Hellenist Jew.

[2] See Lightfoot *Clement* i. pp. 96-7. [3] c. 16.

[4] The contents of cc. 24-26, however, may indicate a renewed tendency among the Corinthians to disbelieve in the resurrection.

[5] cc. 60, 61. The date of the Epistle is about A.D. 95: on Domitian's persecution see Ramsay *Ch. in the R. E.* pp. 259 ff. Edmundson, however, in his Bampton Lectures *The Church of Rome in the First Century* (Longmans, 1913) argues with some reason for an earlier date, 70 A.D., see pp. 189 ff.: the reference would then be to the Neronian persecution. But on the whole I prefer the usual (later) date.

upon each man knowing, and submissively keeping, his place in the common order.[1] In the wider area, he loves to think of order as 'heaven's first law,' as the life of the whole of nature and the joy of the angelic hosts.[2] His mind is akin to Richard Hooker's as he meditated when he lay a-dying 'the number and nature of angels and their blessed obedience and order, without which peace could not be in heaven; and oh that it might be so on earth!' Then finally in the kingdom of God's redemptive love there is order also. On this consideration are based the special exhortations to the suppression of selfish ambition and rivalry which Clement's church addresses under his guidance to the church at Corinth.[3] For, led by one or two reckless and ambitious young men,[4] the Corinthians had rebelled against their legitimate hierarchy, had causelessly deposed some of their presbyters, and—whether or no they had other presbyters with them taking part in the rebellion—had raised a schism against them and left their obedience. The evil had lasted some time, but the Roman church had not hitherto been able to bring pressure to bear upon them owing to the 'sudden and successive calamities and disasters' it was passing through under the persecuting rule of Domitian.

Occasion of the letter;

The Epistle runs to this effect. The Corinthians are bidden to bear in mind the shame it will be if a reputation such as their church has borne is allowed to be overthrown by the ambitions of two or three, and the foolish party spirit of the rest. They used to be men walking after the ordinances of God, in due submission to their spiritual rulers, holding in

its substance.

[1] c. 37. [2] cc. 20, 34, 60.

[3] He does not shrink from adducing examples of pagan self-sacrifice in the cause of unity: πολλοὶ ἐξεχώρησαν ἰδίων πόλεων ἵνα μὴ στασιάζωσιν ἐπὶ πλεῖον (c. 55).

[4] Their youth seems to follow from the emphasis Clement lays (c. 3) on the reverence due from youth to age.

abomination all sedition and schism. But now there is a reversal of all this. There is amongst them a renewed outbreak of the old danger of partisan adherence to particular leaders,[1] against which St. Paul had warned them. But the last evil is worse than the first, for their proclivities are directed now not to apostolic men but to self-interested schismatics. They should recognise how in Scripture and history, ancient and recent, all evils have come of jealousy and self-interest such as stir party leaders and their followers—even as in their own generation such tempers had caused St. Peter and St. Paul to be put to death—while all good, on the other hand, has come of obedience and humility. They should recognise how the divine principle of order prevails in nature, in civil and military government, in the organism of the human body, in the very mission of Christ—a divine principle which upon all men and things makes everywhere the claim of submission and obedience. Above all, this must be recognised in the Church. Of old there had been a divinely ordained ministry of Moses' appointment certificated by a special miracle of the budding rod, and the sanction of a miraculous punishment on those who invaded its peculiar privileges. And just as in the Jerusalem of the old covenant there is a divine law of service, a divine prescription of times and places and persons, under which high-priest, priest, Levite, and layman must each observe the appointed rule of his service, so also the principle has passed into the new covenant. Here too he that would serve God and offer his worship with acceptableness must submit to requirements of time and place and the appropriation of special functions to special orders.

Thus under the Christian covenant the Apostles instituted in the churches which they founded a

[1] c. 47 προσκλίσεις.

ministry of bishops and deacons, in continuation of their own mission from Christ and in fulfilment of prophecy: and further, in view of the strife which they foresaw would arise over the 'episcopal' office, they made provision for a succession in this ministry. Now it was men appointed in accordance with this apostolic provision by men of repute in the Church with the consent of the whole body, and who had fulfilled their ministry without reproach—it was such men whom the Corinthians had now deposed from their sacred functions. What a sin was such deposition! What a judgment it must bring on those who are guilty of it!

So seriously and authoritatively does the Roman community bid the Corinthians hear God's will speaking by them, to consider their ways and be wise: and the letter passes into a prayer, the prayer of one who 'lifts up holy hands without wrath or doubting' in orderly and harmonious intercession—intercession which seems to represent the form which, under Clement's auspices, was being given to the 'prayer of the oblation' in the Roman Church.

We proceed to quote the passages which have an immediate bearing on the principle and form of the ministry. Passages bearing on the ministry.

Formerly 'ye did all things without respect of persons, and ye walked after the laws of God, submitting to your rulers and rendering to the presbyters among you their appropriate honour;[1] and upon your

[1] c. 1: *ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν καὶ τιμὴν τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς παρ' ὑμῖν πρεσβυτέροις*: cf. c. 21 *τοὺς προηγουμένους ἡμῶν αἰδεσθῶμεν, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἡμῶν τιμήσωμεν, τοὺς νέους παιδεύσωμεν κ.τ.λ.* Lightfoot translates the word *πρεσβύτεροι* in these passages 'the older men,' 'the elders' in age, but the word is used of the church officers in cc. 47 and 57, and must be given the same meaning here (see Gebhardt and Harnack *in loc.*). The use of *τιμή* is almost technical, see *Didache* xv. 2: *αὐτοὶ γάρ* [bishops and deacons] *εἰσιν οἱ τετιμημένοι ὑμῶν μετὰ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων*, and cf. 1 Tim. v. 17. It is no objection to this that the 'presbyters' are opposed to the 'young men': the same antithesis appears in 1 Peter v. 1-5 and Polyc. *ad Phil.* 5, 6, where there can be no doubt of the reference to office. The word still retained the associations of age: very likely in the earliest Church, where clergy were not debarred from ordinary work, an elder man, if his reputation was satisfactory, commonly became a presbyter in office. Here the antithesis of elder and younger is partly due to the fact that the rebels seem to have

young men ye enjoined a modest and grave state of mind, and your women ye enjoined to do all in a blameless and grave and pure conscience.'

But now all is changed: 'men were stirred up, the mean against the honourable, the ill-reputed against the highly-reputed, the foolish against the wise, the young against the elders.'[1]

'Let us fear the Lord Jesus whose blood was given for us; let us reverence our rulers, let us honour our presbyters, let us instruct our young men in the lesson of the fear of God, let us bring back our women to the standard of good behaviour.'[2]

'Let us enlist ourselves with all earnestness in His faultless ordinances. Let us consider those who are enlisted under our rulers,[3] with what order, with what submission, with what subordination they accomplish what is enjoined. All are not prefects, nor rulers of thousands, nor rulers of hundreds, nor rulers of fifties, and so forth, but each one in his own order accomplishes what is enjoined by the king and the rulers. The great cannot exist without the small nor the small without the great; there is a certain mixture in all things and therein is utility. Let us take our body as an instance. The head is nothing without the feet, nor the feet without the head . . . All parts conspire and accept one obedience for the preservation of the whole body. Therefore let our whole body be preserved in Christ Jesus, and let each man submit to his neighbour, even as he was appointed in the special grace given him.'[4]

'All this then being manifest to us, we, as we have gazed into the depths of the divine knowledge, ought to do all that the Lord commanded to be performed in order, at appointed times. The offerings and ministrations he commanded to take place, not at random or without order, but at definite times and hours. Where and by whom He wills that they should be performed, He Himself ordained by His supreme choice, so that all being done holily in well-pleasing might be acceptable to His will. Those then who accomplish their offerings at the appointed times are acceptable and blessed, for following the laws of the Master they fall into no sin. For to the high-priest his own proper ministrations have been assigned, and to the priests their proper place ordained, and their proper ministries enjoined upon the Levites; the layman has been bound by the layman's ordinances.[5] Let each of us, brethren, in his own order make his eucharist

---

been young men. Hermas exactly in the same way (as will be noticed, p. 293) distinguishes προηγούμενοι from πρωτοκαθεδρῖται (=πρεσβύτεροι). This is, I think, enough to remove any doubt that may be felt as to Clement's language.

[1] c. 3: τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, but the reference is to Isaiah (Is. iii. 5).

[2] c. 21: τοὺς προηγουμένους ἡμῶν, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἡμῶν. Here again 'rulers' are specified besides 'presbyters' as the authorities in the Church.

[3] τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ἡμῶν, i.e. here our secular rulers.

[4] cc. 37, 38. The last words are καθὼς καὶ ἐτέθη ἐν τῷ χαρίσματι αὐτοῦ.

[5] c. 40: Προδήλων οὖν ἡμῖν ὄντων τούτων, καὶ ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως, πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν ὅσα ὁ δεσπότης ἐπιτελεῖν ἐκέλευσεν κατὰ καιροὺς τεταγμένους· τάς τε προσφορὰς καὶ λειτουργίας οὐκ εἰκῇ ἢ ἀτάκτως ἐκέλευσεν

to God [or 'please God'] in gravity, abiding in a good conscience, not transgressing the appointed rule of his ministration. Not everywhere, brethren, are offered the daily sacrifices or freewill-offerings or sin- and trespass-offerings, but in Jerusalem alone; even there offering is made not in every place but before the holy place at the altar, after the offering has been inspected by the high-priest and the aforesaid ministers. They then who do anything contrary to what His will has thought fitting have death for their penalty. See, brethren, inasmuch as we have been thought worthy of more knowledge, to so much greater a peril are we subject.'[1]

'The Apostles were sent to us with the Gospel from the Lord Jesus Christ, Jesus the Christ was sent forth from God. Christ then is from God and the Apostles from Christ; all took place in both cases in due order by the will of God. They then having received commandments

---

γίνεσθαι ἀλλ' ὡρισμένοις καιροῖς καὶ ὥραις· ποῦ τε καὶ διὰ τίνων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι θέλει, αὐτὸς ὥρισεν τῇ ὑπερτάτῳ αὐτοῦ βουλήσει, ἵν' ὁσίως πάντα γινόμενα ἐν εὐδοκήσει εὐπρόσδεκτα εἴη τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ. οἱ οὖν τοῖς προστεταγμένοις καιροῖς ποιοῦντες τὰς προσφορὰς αὐτῶν εὐπρόσδεκτοί τε καὶ μακάριοι· τοῖς γὰρ νομίμοις τοῦ δεσπότου ἀκολουθοῦντες οὐ διαμαρτάνουσιν. τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεῖ ἴδιαι λειτουργίαι δεδομέναι εἰσὶν καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος προστέτακται καὶ Λευίταις ἴδιαι διακονίαι ἐπίκεινται· ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται.

It will be apparent, as this and the following chapters are read, that the Church of the new covenant is spoken of under terms of the old, so instinctively alive is Clement to the continuity of principle between the two. 'Non negare possum,' says Lipsius, 'v.t. hierarchiam quae vocatur, hoc loco ad Christianorum societatem accommodari.' As the layman is probably the Christian layman (for the adjective λαϊκός is not used of the Jewish 'layman' in the LXX or elsewhere, see Harnack *Constitution and Law* p. 72), it is natural to suppose that there was a threefold Christian ministry corresponding to the high-priest, priest, and Levite, but it must be observed that an analogy is claimed in respect of place and time, as well as of ministers, and, as it cannot be pressed in the former case, so also it cannot in the latter. But the language is certainly more natural if Clement had in view a threefold Christian ministry.

[1] c. 41 Lightfoot's text: *Ἕκαστος ἡμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι εὐχαριστείτω θεῷ ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων, μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὡρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα, ἐν σεμνότητι. οὐ πανταχοῦ, ἀδελφοί, προσφέρονται θυσίαι ἐνδελεχισμοῦ ἢ εὐχῶν ἢ περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ πλημμελείας, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ μόνῃ· κἀκεῖ δὲ οὐκ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ προσφέρεται, ἀλλ' ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ναοῦ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, μωμοσκοπηθὲν τὸ προσφερόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τῶν προειρημένων λειτουργῶν· οἱ οὖν παρὰ τὸ καθῆκον τῆς βουλήσεως αὐτοῦ ποιοῦντές τι, θάνατον τὸ πρόστιμον ἔχουσιν. ὁρᾶτε, ἀδελφοί· ὅσῳ πλείονος κατηξιώθημεν γνώσεως, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὑποκείμεθα κινδύνῳ.*

I have translated *εὐχαριστείτω* 'make his eucharist.' Clement uses the word in a general sense for 'to give thanks' in c. 38. But here, if he used the word, he would be describing that formal act of thanksgiving in which the whole Church approaches in due order before God, and that is the Eucharist in the technical sense. The verb has its technical meaning in the *Didache* (ix. 1, x. 1, 7, xiv. 1) in close connexion with its general meaning (ix. 2, x. 2) and the substantive *εὐχαριστία* also occurs there (ix. 1) in its technical sense. It appears, however, that the author of the *Apostolic Church Order* read *εὐαρεστείτω* in St. Clement, since he presumably had our passage in mind when he wrote (c. 23), *ὁ λαϊκὸς τοῖς λαϊκοῖς πράγμασι . . . ἕκαστος τῷ ἰδίῳ τόπῳ ἀρεσκέτω τῷ θεῷ*: and this is the reading of the Constantinople MS. and of the Syriac version and of Morin's Latin. Thus Harnack prefers it (*Texte u. Untersuch.* Band ii, Heft 5, p. 27) and probably rightly.

and having been fully assured through the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ and confirmed in the word of God, with full assurance of the Holy Spirit went forth preaching the Gospel that the kingdom of God was about to come. Preaching then in country and town they appointed their firstfruits, when they had tested them in the Spirit, for bishops and deacons of those who were about to become believers. And this was no new thing, for of old it had been written about bishops and deacons. For thus says the Scripture: "I will appoint their bishops in righteousness and their deacons in faith" (Is. lx. 17).[1] And what wonder is it if those who were entrusted in Christ with such a work from God appointed these aforesaid officers? Since even the blessed Moses, the "faithful servant in all the house," indicated all that was enjoined upon him in the sacred books.'

Here follows a description of Moses' conduct (Numb. xvii.) when 'envy arose as to the priesthood and the tribes were seething with discord because they were ambitious of that glorious title.' Moses knew beforehand, he says, that Aaron's rod would bud. But he acted as he did to prevent disorder in Israel, and for God's glory.[2] So in the same way, he continues:

'Our Apostles also knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be contention about the title of the episcopate. Therefore on this account, having received perfect foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid [bishops and deacons], and subsequently gave an additional injunction that, if they fell asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministry. They, then, who were appointed by those [Apostles] or subsequently by other distinguished men with the consent of the whole [local] church, and who have exercised their ministry blamelessly to the flock of Christ with humility, quietly and without display, and have had good witness borne them by all again and again, these we do not think to be justly cast out of their ministry. For it will be no small sin to us if we cast out of the episcopate those

[1] c. 42: Οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῖν εὐηγγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ι. ὁ Χ. ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξεπέμφθη. ὁ Χριστὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἐγένοντο οὖν ἀμφότερα εὐτάκτως ἐκ θελήματος θεοῦ. παραγγελίας οὖν λαβόντες καὶ πληροφορηθέντες διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Κ. Ἰ. Χ. καὶ πιστωθέντες ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, μετὰ πληροφορίας πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐξῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ μέλλειν ἔρχεσθαι. κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν. καὶ τοῦτο οὐ καινῶς κ.τ.λ.

[2] c. 43: ζῆλου ἐμπεσόντος περὶ τῆς ἱερωσύνης καὶ στασιαζουσῶν τῶν φυλῶν ὁποία αὐτῶν εἴη τῷ ἐνδόξῳ ὀνόματι κεκοσμημένη κ.τ.λ. Moses is afterwards said to lay the rods ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν τοῦ θεοῦ, and then to explain that the rod of whichever tribe should bud, ταύτην ἐκλέλεκται ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸ ἱερατεύειν καὶ λειτουργεῖν αὐτῷ. But Moses foreknew (προῄδει) the result.

who have blamelessly and holily offered the oblations. Blessed are those presbyters who passed on their journey before, for they made their departure with good fruit and completeness; for they have no cause for fear lest any one remove them from their determined place. For we perceive that you have removed some, though their conversation was honourable, out of the ministry which had been observed by them without reproach'[1]

'It is shameful, dearly beloved, yes utterly shameful and unworthy of the life in Christ, that it should be reported that the very steadfast

[1] c. 44: Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομὴν ἔδωκαν ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χ. μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης, ἡσύχως καὶ ἀβαναύσως, μεμαρτυρημένους τε πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὸ πάντων, τούτους οὐ δικαίως νομίζομεν ἀποβάλλεσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας. ἁμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται ἐὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προσενεγκόντας τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλωμεν. μακάριοι οἱ προοδοιπορήσαντες πρεσβύτεροι, οἵτινες ἔγκαρπον καὶ τελείαν ἔσχον τὴν ἀνάλυσιν· οὐ γὰρ εὐλαβοῦνται μή τις αὐτοὺς μεταστήσῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱδρυμένου αὐτοῖς τόπου. ὁρῶμεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐνίους ὑμεῖς μετηγάγετε καλῶς πολιτευομένους ἐκ τῆς ἀμέμπτως αὐτοῖς τετιμημένης λειτουργίας.

(*a*) In spite of variations in mss. and versions, the word given above, ἐπινομήν, has been accepted as right since the discovery by Dom Morin of a primitive Latin version (see *Anecdota Maredsolana* ii. [1894], Parker's, Oxford) which reads 'legem dederunt.' 'Legem' would render ἐπινομήν, ignoring the preposition, as 'sciebat' renders προγ̓δει just before, c. xliii. 6. We may assume then that this word means 'an additional injunction,' that the reference in τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν is to the ministry of the 'bishops' (cf. the constant use of λειτουργία and λειτουργεῖν in this chapter), and that the words ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν refer also to them and not to the apostles. Thus the meaning of the passage is plain enough. The Apostles made some arrangement to secure an unquestionable succession to the office of the presbyter-bishops, if its first holders should pass away (before the end, and if the Apostles also were no longer at hand to appoint new ones). The result of this arrangement had been that, in the interval since the appointment of the first presbyters by the Apostles, other presbyters had been duly appointed by certain 'distinguished men' in the Church. It seems to me certain that these ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες, who in accordance with the apostolic arrangement had since their death appointed 'approved men,' are not the same as the 'approved men,' but different. The apostolic arrangement must have consisted in providing that there should be after their death this body of 'distinguished men' in the Church to appoint presbyters and deacons. See Kühl *Gemeindeordnung* p. 135-8. [But I am still tempted to wonder whether ἐπινομὴν ἔδωκαν may not mean 'they instituted a jurisdiction' or 'supervision'? Cf. the schol. on Pindar *Pyth.* xi. 7 (quoted in Stephanus *Thesaurus Ling. Grasc.* s.v. ἐπίνομος) ἐπίνομον τὸν σύννομον ταῖς Θήβαις τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοῦ καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπινομῆς. Otherwise ἐπινομή is used (1) very frequently by Galen *de Fasciis* to mean the revolutions or additional applications of a bandage. He describes first the original direction in which it is to be applied (ἐπινέμησις), and then directs that it should be rolled on in the same direction—αἱ δὲ ἐπινομαὶ κατὰ τῶν αὐτῶν. See Kühn *Medici Graeci* vol. xviii. pp. 787. 16, 791. 11, 791. 1, 793. 11, 795. 1, 12, etc. (2) By Plutarch for the advance of a fire, 'depastio ignis.' But whether or no ἐπινομή can mean jurisdiction or supervision, it does seem to me that the meaning of the apostolic arrangement is made manifest by its result, namely, that there had existed since the Apostles a body of 'distinguished men' to appoint, with the consent of the whole church, to the local church offices.]

(*b*) οὐ δικαίως νομίζομεν ἀποβάλλεσθαι κ.τ.λ. St. Clement uses somewhat

and ancient church of the Corinthians, for the sake of one or two persons, is making sedition against its presbyters.'[1]

'Who therefore [with reference to Moses' conduct, Exod. xxxii. 30 f.] is noble among you? Who is compassionate? Who is fulfilled with love? Let him say: "If by reason of me there be faction and strife and schisms, I retire, I depart, whither ye will, and I do that which is ordered by the people: only let the flock of Christ be at peace with its duly-appointed presbyters."'[2]

'Ye therefore that laid the foundation of the sedition, submit yourselves unto the presbyters and receive chastisement unto repentance, bending the knees of your heart.'[3]

'It is right for us to give heed to so great and so many examples and to submit the neck and, occupying the place of obedience, to take our side with them that are the leaders of our souls.'[4]

Results:

It remains for us to sum up the evidence of Clement's Epistle so far as it affects the ministry.

(1) The ministry has (*a*) authority in government;

(*b*) a distinct function in the 'liturgy.'

(1) St. Clement speaks of the ministry in the Church from two points of view. It represents the authority of government, and so claims obedience: but it has also its special function in relation to worship. The 'liturgy' of the Christian Church is the perpetuation in principle of the 'liturgy' of the Jews, and the Christian Church, like the Church of the old covenant, approaches God as one body, differentiated in function, with grades of privilege

minimizing language of the highest goods and the worst evils, cf. c. 19, where he speaks of the character of the saints having 'improved us.' In this moderation of tone he contrasts with Ignatius.

(*c*) *προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα.* Cf. *Apost. Const.* viii. 12. 3: *οἱ διάκονοι προσαγέτωσαν τὰ δῶρα τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ.* Knowing as we do that Irenaeus and Justin Martyr alike regarded the 'sacrifice' of the Eucharist as centering round the oblations of the bread and wine, and having in view the fact that Clement is here speaking of the Church's 'liturgy' as the spiritual counterpart of the sacrificial 'liturgy' of the old covenant, it seems to me impossible to doubt that the words *δῶρα προσφέρειν* here refer to the offering of the eucharistic gifts. Cf. Harnack *Texte u. Untersuch.* Band ii, Heft 2, p. 144, note 73: 'Beyond a doubt the *προσφέρειν δῶρα τῷ θεῷ*, in the sense of offering sacrifices (Opferdarbringung), appears as the most important function of the episcopi': and cf. the quotation from his *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 204 n.[2] above, and his *Constitution and Law* p. 70.

(*d*) For *τοῦ ἱδρυμένου αὐτοῖς τόπου* cf. c. 40 *τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος.*

[1] c. 47.

[2] c. 54 *μετὰ τῶν καθεσταμένων πρεσβυτέρων.*

[3] c. 57.

[4] c. 63: *τὸν τῆς ὑπακοῆς τόπον ἀναπληρώσαντας* (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 16) *προσκλιθῆναι τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ἀρχηγοῖς τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν.* For *τόπος* see, besides 1 Cor. xiv. 16, cc. 40, 44, and Lightfoot *in loc.*: the layman too has his *τόπος*.

and dignity, by the appointment of God.[1] Thus it is the special function of the bishops to 'offer the gifts.' It is often said that Clement regards the distinction of offices in the Church as only matter of 'order,' not of exclusive power. He does however speak of each member of the Church as qualified for his special function by a special charisma;[2] and, though he speaks of mutual subordination as the principle of 'utility,' yet he illustrates it not only by the distinction of grades in the Roman army, but by the differentiation of limbs in the human body, and by the divinely ordained hierarchy of the Jewish Church. There is no reason whatever to believe that the 'charisma' of any 'member of the body' who was not a presbyter-bishop would have qualified him to offer the gifts.

(2) Clement expresses very plainly the fundamental principle of the apostolic succession. The Church's officers are appointed from above. The body of the Church indeed has the privilege of assent or dissent in their appointment,[3] and Clement implies that under circumstances of misconduct it could legitimately secure their deposition,[4] but he clearly never conceives that it could appoint them. The ministers of the Church must derive their authority from that one mission by which Christ came forth from God and the Apostles from Christ: in virtue of which these same Apostles appointed bishops and deacons in the churches which they first founded, and afterwards took measures to secure the perpetuation of

(2) It is derived by succession from the Apostles.

[1] It corresponds to the high value which Clement clearly sets upon the Church's worship that he should give us, as apparently he does, the eucharistic intercession, with which he was accustomed to lead the worship of his church (cc. 59-61). His language influenced the Liturgy of St. Mark; see Lightfoot's notes, and Brightman *Liturgies Eastern and Western* i. 131, 559.

[2] c. 38: καθὼς καὶ ἐτέθη ἐν τῷ χαρίσματι αὐτοῦ.

[3] c. 44.

[4] This is probably implied in the rebuke for having deposed blameless presbyters (c. 44); cf. also 54: ποιῶ τὰ προστασσόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους, though here the supposed speaker is not necessarily a presbyter.

their office in due *succession*. Clement thus gives us the two principles which involve the 'doctrine of the apostolic succession': the principle that the Church is a differentiated body in which different individuals exercise different and clearly defined functions, and the principle that the right to exercise these functions, so far as they are ministerial, is derived by succession from the Apostles.

(3) There is an order superior to presbyters,

(3) It is generally supposed [1] that in Clement's Epistle we have only two orders of ministers, viz. presbyter-bishops and deacons, recognised in the Church. But this supposition—though there need be no objection to it on the ground of principle—does not seem to account for all the phenomena which the Epistle presents. It is quite true that presbyters are also called bishops, and that there is no local authority in the church *at Corinth* above the presbyters. Clement's language about submission to them postulates this. It may also be acknowledged that it is an unwarrantable hypothesis that the see of Corinth was vacant when Clement wrote. But it does not therefore follow that there is not in this Epistle, as in the *Didache*, the recognition of a superior authority, though it has yet no localized representation in the particular church addressed. On the contrary Clement's language seems to suggest, or even to require, some such supposition. Besides the presbyters whom the Corinthians are to 'honour,' there is mention *on two occasions* [2] of their rulers whom they are to reverence and obey. This repeated mention

[1] As by Dr. Lightfoot *Dissertation* pp. 216, 218; and Dr. Langen *Gesch. der röm. Kirche* i. pp. 80-82. I cannot think that Dr. Bernard (*Studia Sacra*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1917, c. xii. pp. 255 ff.) succeeds in proving that the presbyters of the Epistle are a distinct body from the episcopi, and are the ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες who appointed the episcopi from among their own number. I think that c. 44 proves the identity of presbyters and episcopi by assuming that in removing episcopi from their 'ministry' the Corinthians had removed 'presbyters' from their 'determined place.'

[2] cc. 1, 21. Hermas makes a similar distinction (*Vis.* iii. 9): cf. p. 293 below. See Hilgenfeld in *Zeitschr. für wiss. Theol.*, 1886, p. 23.

of 'rulers' as distinct from 'presbyters,' more particularly as we find the same distinction in the *Shepherd* of Hermas, cannot be overlooked; and the title 'ruler' is already familiar to us as applied to men of the highest order in the Church, like the prophets Judas and Silas, or those who first brought the Gospel to 'the Hebrews,' or the members of the royal family of Christ who 'ruled' in the churches of Palestine.[1] Again there have been certain 'distinguished men,' who in accordance with the arrangement made by the Apostles have, since their death, appointed the presbyters. It appears then that Clement does recognise a body of men who at least appointed the presbyters at Corinth, and whom it is natural to identify with the 'rulers' mentioned elsewhere. 'Rulers' is a general term and we cannot tell what further official title they had, if any, but we must recollect that there is the same absence of a definite official title for the 'men of distinction' like Timothy and Titus, who probably filled exactly the same position during the lifetime of the Apostles. It is quite natural that they should have been known sufficiently well as individuals and as men of quasi-apostolic authority to make an exact title a matter of indifference. Definite terminology is in the region of administration as of theology a gradual growth. It is enough that we should recognise that certain men in the Church were understood to have the apostolic authority to ordain elders and presumably the powers of control which always accompanied that authority. This is a class

[1] Acts xv. 22: Hegesippus ap. Euseb. *H.E.* iii. 32. 6 προηγοῦνται πάσης ἐκκλησίας: Heb. xiii. 7. In this last passage the ἡγούμενοι are those apostolic preachers who have passed away; but in ver. 17 the present authorities amongst the Hebrews, 'who watch for their souls as men who shall give account,' and whom they are to greet (ver. 24), are also called οἱ ἡγούμενοι ὑμῶν. These would more naturally be local 'presbyters' but not necessarily, more especially if the Epistle is not written to any one community: see on these 'rulers' Harnack *Texte u. Untersuch.* Band ii, Heft 1, pp. 94-96. Later the expression is generally used for bishops (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 36. 10; *Apost. Const.* ii. 25. 7, 20. 4, 46. 3, in all cases from the *Didascalia*), but not always.

of men probably similar to the 'prophets' and 'teachers' of the *Didache*, whose authority, as we saw reason to believe, passed over to the local presidents who were known as 'bishops.' Some of them may have been already localized in other churches of Greece; only (as it appears) there was not one on the spot at Corinth, though before the time of Hegesippus a regular succession of diocesan bishops was existing there as elsewhere. The fact that no one of this order was yet resident in Corinth may account for Clement's authoritative appeal to that church.[1]

(4) which Clement represented in Rome.

(4) For, though Clement cannot have been *called* a 'bishop' in the later sense, his position in the earliest tradition is so prominent that he must in fact have been what would have been designated in later times by that name.[2] He merges his own authority, as he writes, in the church which he represents, but in the

[1] It becomes natural then, as the prophet is called the Christian high-priest in the *Didache*, to see in Clement's analogical use of 'high-priest, priest, and Levite,' in speaking of the Christian ministry, a reference to the three orders, of whom the second and third are presbyter-bishops and deacons, but of whom the highest are these 'rulers' and 'distinguished men,' who correspond to the prophets of the *Didache*.

I do not wish to imply that the term ἐλλόγιμος ἀνήρ was at all a title reserved for these apostolic men. Clement uses it quite generally of the Corinthian Christians (c. 62): ἀνδράσι πιστοῖς καὶ ἐλλογιμωτάτοις καὶ ἐγκεκυφόσιν κ.τ.λ. So he uses ἡγούμενοι also of secular rulers (cc. 5, 37, 61, [60]).

[2] The evidence of the Clementines is enough to show us that Clement's personality made a great impression on his own generation and on those that succeeded, and it was as a church ruler and bishop that he impressed himself on the memory. It is Clement in the *Shepherd* who is to communicate the messages given to Hermas to the churches of the other cities (εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις, ἐκείνῳ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται: *Vis.* ii. 4). He appears in the third place in the succession of Roman bishops given by Irenaeus, and in the same place in the catalogue which Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxvii. 6), if Lightfoot is right, *Clement* i. 328 ff., repeated from Hegesippus. It does not seem to me that the absence of specific mention of the bishop in Ignatius' letter to the church of Rome is any evidence at all against there having been one. See Lightfoot *Ignat.* i. p. 381; also *Dissertation* p. 221, where he remarks: 'the reason for supposing Clement to have been a bishop is as strong as the universal tradition of the next ages can make it'; also *Clement* i. p. 68. Clement cannot have been called a 'bishop' in the later sense of the term, because in his epistle he clearly calls the presbyters bishops, and this must reflect the usage of the Roman church. Perhaps, as suggested above, the distinction of men like him, who bore some measure of the apostolic authority, may have made a fixed title not yet indispensable. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv. 17, 105) quotes him as the 'apostle Clement.' His eucharistic prayer, as well as the teaching authority which breathes in his epistle, and which is probably his own, suggests the prerogative freedom of teaching and Eucharist which is assigned to the prophets in the *Didache* (x. 7, xi. xii).

church[1] not in the presbyterate, and the letter therefore affords no evidence at all as to Clement's relation to the other church officers. Thus, if we could get behind the scenes, we should probably find that the chief authority really belonged to him, and that he was one of those 'men of reputation,' one of those 'rulers,' who since the Apostles' death had exercised that part of their ministry which was to become permanent in the Church. One of this order must, we should suppose, always have existed in so eminent a church as Rome.

That this was the case is a good deal more than matter of surmise. Irenaeus records[2] how 'the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, having founded and built up the church (at Rome) committed to Linus the office of the episcopate. This is the Linus of whom Paul makes mention in his letter to Timothy. To him succeeded Anencletus. After him, in the third place from the apostles, Clement was allotted the bishopric; a man who had both seen the blessed apostles and had had intercourse with them, in whose ears their preaching was still echoing and their tradition was still before his eyes; and not his alone, for there were still many then surviving who had been taught by the apostles.' This catalogue of the early Roman succession, which rests probably on the investigations of Hegesippus as well as of Irenaeus,[3] cannot, as Dr. Lightfoot says, 'be treated otherwise than with the highest respect. We can trace it back to a few years later than the middle of the second century. It comes from Rome itself. It was diligently

[1] Dr. Salmon, *Introd.* p. 572 n., calls attention to the fact 'how all through the first two centuries the importance of the bishop of Rome is merged in the importance of his Church'; for instance, how Dionysius of Corinth writes to the *Church* of Rome (Euseb. *H.E.* iv. 23. 10), and how 'when Victor attempted to enforce uniformity of Easter observance, it was still in the name of his Church that he wrote. . . . This is evidenced by the plural ἠξιώσατε in the reply of Polycrates' (Euseb. v. 24. 8).

[2] See above p. 104 n.[3].

[3] See above p. 109, and Lightfoot *Clement* i. 328 ff. (referred to in n.[2] on the previous page).

gathered there and deliberately recorded by two several writers from different parts of Christendom.'[1] It is only necessary to recognise that the Bishops of Rome down to Clement did not bear the episcopal *name*.

V

V. The Epistle of Polycarp.

Its occasion.

The letter of Polycarp to the Philippians was written under the following circumstances. Ignatius, in company with others of the 'noble army of martyrs' bound with the 'sacred fetters,' had passed from Troas to Philippi on his way to Rome. There he had held intercourse with the Philippian Christians, and had bidden them, as he had bidden the other churches, send a letter to the bereaved church of Antioch. It was too far for them, however, to send a messenger; so they wrote to Polycarp of Smyrna to request that his messenger might take their letter, and to request him further to let them have any of Ignatius' letters—whether to his own church or to others—that he might have in his possession. It was in assent to this request that Polycarp wrote the letter which has been preserved to us.

It implies absence of a bishop at Philippi;

This Epistle is remarkable for its exhibition of the saint's character, but remarkable also because of the light it throws on the constitution of the church of Philippi. Polycarp writes no doubt as a bishop—'Polycarp and the presbyters with him'[2]—but he speaks of no bishop at Philippi, only of elders and

[1] *Clement*, i. 66: Bishop Lightfoot's investigations into the early Roman succession have vindicated the Irenaean tradition as the only one which deserves the name. According to this tradition Linus, Anencletus, and Clement are plainly bishops *in succession one to another*. See, on the whole subject, his *Clement* i. pp. 66-8, and the discussion *ib.* pp. 201 ff. He practically treats this succession as certainly historical, pp. 76 ff.

[2] Dr. Hatch (*B. L.*[3] p. 88 n.[8]) denies that Polycarp is here distinguishing himself from his presbyters; but whatever the ambiguities of the phrase, it is cleared up by the letters of Ignatius to Polycarp and to the church of Smyrna. Polycarp was admittedly bishop of Smyrna. He writes moreover in the first person singular.

deacons, and bids the Philippians obey 'the elders and deacons as God and Christ,' as if there was no higher officer in question there: the elders moreover are exhorted in terms which imply that the exercise of discipline and the administration of alms belongs to them.[1] It is of course possible that amongst the presbyters may have been one who was their president and was known as 'bishop,' but Polycarp's language does not suggest it,[2] nor is it a very reasonable hypothesis that the see was vacant. Are we then to conclude that the only church authorities recognised at Philippi were the presbyters and the deacons? There is one consideration which seems to make this view almost untenable. We have already seen that Ignatius when he wrote his epistles from Smyrna certainly regarded episcopacy as extended 'to the ends of the earth':[3] with equal

which must be reconciled with Ignatius' visit.

[1] The following passages are here referred to: cc. 5, 6: Εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται, ὀφείλομεν ἀξίως τῆς ἐντολῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ δόξης περιπατεῖν. ὁμοίως διάκονοι ἄμεμπτοι κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ὡς θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ διάκονοι καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπων· μὴ διάβολοι, μὴ δίλογοι, ἀφιλάργυροι, ἐγκρατεῖς περὶ πάντα, εὔσπλαγχνοι, ἐπιμελεῖς, πορευόμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃς ἐγένετο διάκονος πάντων. Here follow some admonitions to the younger men (νεώτεροι) to be blameless and pure, self-controlled in their lives, keeping free from sensual sin; then he continues: διὸ δέον ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπὸ πάντων τούτων, ὑποτασσομένους τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις ὡς θεῷ καὶ Χριστῷ· τὰς παρθένους ἐν ἀμώμῳ καὶ ἁγνῇ συνειδήσει περιπατεῖν. Καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι δὲ εὔσπλαγχνοι, εἰς πάντας ἐλεήμονες, ἐπιστρέφοντες τὰ ἀποπεπλανημένα, ἐπισκεπτόμενοι πάντας ἀσθενεῖς, μὴ ἀμελοῦντες χήρας ἢ ὀρφανοῦ ἢ πένητος· ἀλλὰ προνοοῦντες ἀεὶ τοῦ καλοῦ ἐνώπιον θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἀπεχόμενοι πάσης ὀργῆς, προσωποληψίας, κρίσεως ἀδίκου, μακρὰν ὄντες πάσης φιλαργυρίας, μὴ ταχέως πιστεύοντες κατά τινος, μὴ ἀπότομοι ἐν κρίσει κ.τ.λ.

Later on in c. 6 it is noticeable that the prophets who are mentioned after the Apostles are the Old Testament prophets who foretold Christ.

c. 9. They are exhorted 'to obey the word of righteousness and to practise all patience,' after the example of the blessed Ignatius and Zosimus and Rufus and after others who had lived among them, as well as of the Apostles. Then (in c. 11, where the Greek fails us) mention is made of the case of a presbyter Valens, 'qui presbyter factus est aliquando apud vos, quod sic ignoret is locum qui datus est ei.' It appears that he had sinned through avarice and impurity and want of truth, and had shown himself quite unfit for an office of government. 'Valde ergo, fratres, contristor pro illo et pro coniuge eius, quibus det Dominus paenitentiam veram.'

[2] Winterstein *Der Episkopat* p. 40 thinks that there must have been a 'bishop,' because only here are 'deacons' associated with presbyters; but this argument has no force for those who admit that the titles presbyter and episcopus were at one time synonymous. Polycarp of course would not call the presbyters bishops as St. Paul did (Phil. i. 1). The titles had become distinct. He speaks of presbyters and deacons only.

[3] *ad Eph.* 3.

certainty he regarded it as an essential of church organization—'without these [the three orders],' he had written, 'no church has a title to the name.'[1] He moved from Smyrna to Troas, and his tone is still the same; there is the same insistence upon episcopacy. He went on to Philippi and enjoyed, as we gather, the same cordial intercourse which he had held in other churches.[2] He left behind him when he passed on a venerated name. Had he rebuked them or remonstrated with them in any way, we must certainly have caught an echo of it through their correspondence with Polycarp. It is impossible, on the other hand, to believe that Ignatius suddenly dropped the urgent tone about episcopacy which had been one of the two main topics of all that he wrote in Asia. Can we then consistently with the phenomena of Polycarp's letter suppose some such state of things at Philippi as would not have shocked the mind of Ignatius? The hypothesis of a superior order in the Church, such as Clement's letter has been seen to imply, of which no representative was yet localized in the church at Philippi, seems to meet the conditions of the problem. This would suggest a special reason why the 'apostolic and prophetic teacher and bishop' Polycarp[3] should address his exhortations to them, as it suggested a reason for the similar appeal of

Probable solution.

[1] *ad Trall.* 3. I cannot think that Dr. Lightfoot is justified (*Ignatius* i. 382) in saying that 'There is no indication that he is upholding the episcopal against any other form of Church government, as for instance the presbyteral. . . . If Ignatius had been writing to' a church which was under presbyteral government 'he would doubtless have required its submission "to the presbyters and deacons."' As it is, he is dealing with communities where episcopacy had been already matured, and therefore he demands obedience to their bishops.' It seems to me as clear as day that Ignatius regarded episcopacy as universal, and as the only legitimate form of church government.

[2] This we gather from the tone in which Polycarp's letter implies that the Philippians had written about him; see c. 13. Ignatius himself, we should notice, had written to Polycarp from Philippi (ἐγράψατέ μοι καὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ Ἰγνάτιος).

[3] For Polycarp's prophetic character see his *Martyrium* cc. 5 and 16: ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις διδάσκαλος ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικὸς γενόμενος, ἐπίσκο ς τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας.

Clement to the Corinthians. This would postulate a state of things at Philippi which Ignatius could at once have recognised as agreeable to his standard of apostolic requirements. It is probable that Ignatius himself had been not merely the bishop of Antioch but the only representative of episcopal authority in Syria,[1] just as later in the century it is not impossible that there was only one bishop in the churches of South Gaul.[2] What we would suggest is not exactly that Philippi was in the diocese of Thessalonica,[3] or of some other see, but that we have still to do with a state of things which is transitional between what is represented in the *Didache* and the localized episcopate which already existed probably in every town-church of Greece by the middle of the second century.

VI

VI. The *Shepherd* of Hermas.

It only remains for us to consider the evidence of the *Shepherd*. This document is one of those in the

[1] On the position of Ignatius in Syria see *ad Rom.* 2: τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας κατηξίωσεν ὁ θεὸς εὑρεθῆναι εἰς δύσιν, ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς μεταπεμψάμενος. He also speaks of himself as representing 'the church in Syria' (*ad Eph.* 21, *ad Magn.* 14, *ad Trall.* 13, *ad Rom.* 9), as well as 'the church in Antioch of Syria' (*ad Philad.* 10, *ad Smyrn.* 11, *ad Polyc.* 7). Perhaps by 'Syria' would be meant only what after Hadrian's division was called Syria Coele or Magna Syria: see *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Geogr.* s.v. SYRIA. Dr. Lightfoot says (i. p. 383): 'Of a diocese, properly so called, there is no trace. . . . The bishop and presbyters are the ministry of a city, not of a diocese. What provision may have been made for the rural districts we are not told.' The suggestion above is that there was originally a ministry-in-chief unlocalized, and that only gradually was a representative of this ministry localized with the name of 'bishop' in every church. There is, however, no evidence against the bishop of a city having had from the first the supervision of the Christians in the surrounding district, until chorepiscopi were appointed.

[2] See Eusebius' expression, *H. E.* v. 23. 3: τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν παροικιῶν ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπεσκόπει: cf. Duchesne *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* i. pp. 39-43. (The same expression, however, is used in the previous chapter of the different 'parishes' of Alexandria in the more modern sense; see App. Note B, p. 315 n.[2]) In the fourth century we know that there was only one bishop in Scythia, and this was regarded as traditional; see Sozomen *H. E.* vi. 21: τοῦτο τὸ ἔθνος πολλὰς μὲν ἔχει καὶ πόλεις καὶ κώμας καὶ φρούρια· μητρόπολις δέ ἐστι Τόμις, πόλις μεγάλη καὶ εὐδαίμων, παράλιος . . . εἰσέτι δὲ καὶ νῦν ἔθος παλαιὸν ἐνθάδε κρατεῖ τοῦ παντὸς ἔθνους ἕνα τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκοπεῖν.

[3] Thessalonica is reported by Origen, in his commentary on Rom. xvi. 23, to have had Gaius for its first bishop.

Its date.

case of which the internal evidence of date is in conflict with the external. For, on the one hand, all that Hermas says about the Christian ministry suggests such an early date as accords naturally with a mention of Clement—presumably the well-known Clement—as the person in the Roman Church whose duty it was to send to other cities the visions vouchsafed to Hermas. On the other hand, we have positive information from a writer of the next generation that Hermas wrote the *Shepherd* at a period which can hardly be earlier than A.D. 140.[1]

What then are the hints given us by Hermas as to the condition of the ministry?

Its language about the ministry

(1) He speaks of 'the presbyters who preside over the Church,'[2] and these must no doubt be identified with the occupants of the 'chief seat' whom he

[1] Namely, the author of the Muratorian fragment, who asserts: 'Pastorem vero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit, sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo fratre eius.' This is too definite a statement for us to reject, even if with Lightfoot, *Clement* ii. pp. 405-413, we ascribe the fragment to Hippolytus and to the later decades of the second century. But, accepting it, what are we to make of the reference in the *Shepherd* to a Clement whose duty it is to send Hermas' visions to foreign churches (*Vis.* ii. 4. 3. quoted in the next note)? Pius became bishop of Rome not after, but not very much before, A.D. 140. How then can Hermas refer to Clement as his contemporary? (1) We may, with Salmon *Introd.* p. 571 f., reject the whole statement of the Muratorian fragment: but this is, as was said just above, too arbitrary a course to adopt. (2) We may suppose that the Clement referred to is another Clement, and his office not the bishopric: but the phrase about sending to other cities seems quite obviously to allude to the historical Clement's authorship of the epistle to the church of Corinth. (3) We may conjecture that Hermas only published under Pius' episcopate visions that he had seen long ago when Clement was bishop: but there would remain the chronological difficulty that at the date of his visions he was already a married man with a grown-up family (*Vis.* i. 3, ii. 3), and if some forty years elapsed between the death of Clement and the accession of Pius, he would have been almost too old to publish. Still this seems a possible view. (4) The last alternative, and perhaps the least improbable, is to understand the reference to Clement as symbolic. Origen treats all three names here, Grapte, Clement, Hermas, as allegorical: see *de Princip.* iv. 11 (*Philocalia* i. 11). But none of these solutions is entirely satisfactory, and the uncertainty as to date renders the use of the book difficult. On the whole, however, Salmon's view seems to find fewer followers of late years: Lightfoot between his *Philippians* pp. 168, 169, and his *Clement* i. p. 4, *Apostolic Fathers* p. 294, seems to have gradually acquired somewhat more confidence in the statement of the Muratorian fragment.

[2] *Vis.* ii. 4. 3.: γράψεις οὖν δύο βιβλαρίδια, καὶ πέμψεις ἓν Κλήμεντι καὶ ἓν Γραπτῇ· πέμψει οὖν Κλήμης εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις, ἐκείνῳ γὰρ ἐπιτέτραπται· Γραπτὴ δὲ νουθετήσει τὰς χήρας καὶ τοὺς ὀρφανούς· σὺ δὲ ἀναγνώσῃ εἰς ταύτην τὴν πόλιν μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν προϊσταμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας. (There is nothing to indicate Clement's relation to the presbyters.)

mentions elsewhere.[1] The 'chief seat' is also spoken of as an object of ambition to false prophets and others.[2] We also hear of deacons who abused their diaconate to make money, plundering widows and orphans.[3] So far then the government of the church of Rome appears to be a government of presbyters, assisted by deacons in the administration of alms.

(2) We have also mention twice over of church 'rulers,' and on one of the two occasions they are unmistakably distinguished, as in Clement's letter, from the occupants of the 'chief seat.'[4] So far the phenomena are exactly the same as those presented by Clement's letter.

(3) Thirdly, we have mention of 'apostles and teachers who preached over the whole world and who taught with gravity and purity the word of the Lord.' Both classes are spoken of as having 'received the Holy Ghost,' and both belong to the past generation.[5] Here again there is no difficulty.

(4) There is mention also of 'bishops' who exercised hospitality and protected the needy and the widows,[6] and in another place a list is given of the worthies of the church ministry, past and present, as follows: 'Apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons, who walked according to the gravity of

in spite of ambiguities

[1] *Vis.* iii. 9. 7, quoted in n.[4] on this page.

[2] *Mand.* xi. 12: ὁ δοκῶν πνεῦμα ἔχειν ὑψοῖ ἑαυτὸν καὶ θέλει πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἔχειν. Cf. *Sim.* viii. 7. 4: ζῆλόν τινα περὶ πρωτείων. In the *Shepherd* the prophet has no official dignity in the Church, see App. Note I, pp. 355, 356.

[3] *Sim.* ix. 26. 2. *Ib.* 15. 4 we read of προφῆται τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ: here the reference is to the prophets of the Old Testament, so that the word διάκονοι must be used in a general sense, meaning 'ministers.'

[4] *Vis.* ii. 2. 6: ἐρεῖς οὖν τοῖς προηγουμένοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας and iii. 9. 7: ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς προηγουμένοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῖς πρωτοκαθεδρίταις.

[5] *Sim.* ix. 25. 2. The apostles are not identical with the teachers (*Sim.* ix. 16. 5 οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι) and are once mentioned by themselves (*Sim.* ix. 17. 1: they were the preachers to 'the twelve tribes who inhabit the whole world,' and are therefore presumably reckoned as twelve). But both apostles and teachers belong to the past generation and were the original proclaimers of the gospel (*Sim.* ix. 15. 4). Together they are symbolized under forty stones in the fabric of the tower which is the Church.

[6] *Sim.* ix. 27. 2: ἐπίσκοποι [καὶ] φιλόξενοι, οἵτινες ἡδέως εἰς τοὺς οἴκους ἑαυτῶν πάντοτε ὑπεδέξαντο τοὺς δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἄτερ ὑποκρίσεως· οἱ δὲ ἐπίσκοποι κ.τ.λ.

God and exercised their episcopate and taught and ministered with purity and gravity to the elect of God.'[1] Now if these visions were seen and written down in the days of Clement, we should naturally identify the 'bishops' with the 'presbyters who preside,' and suppose that the 'teachers' are inserted out of place or perhaps that the 'bishops' are called 'teachers' also, like the 'pastors' (i.e. presbyter-bishops) of Eph. iv. 11. On the other hand, if, as we are almost forced to believe, the writing dates from the days of Pius, we can hardly do otherwise than interpret bishops in the later sense and suppose that the 'teachers' are the presbyters here, to which again the passage of St. Paul just referred to would be a parallel. In this case we should naturally identify the 'bishops' with the 'rulers,' and should suppose that in the interval since Clement's Epistle these rulers had become localized in the different churches as bishops and that, though as such they would have sat among the presbyters on the 'chief seat' and been reckoned among them, they can yet be classed apart as a separate order and spoken of either by the title of 'bishop,' which belonged to their local presidency, or by their general name of 'rulers.'

suggests an order superior to presbyters.

In any case it seems clear that this document adds considerably to the force of the argument derived from Clement's language, that even when the presbyters were the chief local authorities they were still in subordination to 'rulers,' who represented, since the apostles and teachers had passed away, the chief authority in the Church.

Summary for the West.

In summing up the results derived from a consideration of the historical links which in the Western Church connect the age of the Apostles with that of

[1] *Vis.* iii. 5. 1.

Irenaeus, there are two theories which require notice besides the one which we have been led to adopt.

Possible theories: (i) equal colleges of presbyter-bishops;

There is the view (which is undoubtedly supported by the Epistle of Polycarp, taken alone) that the churches in the West were governed simply by a council of presbyters, who had no superiors over them, and who must therefore be supposed to have handed on their own ministry. There is no objection on ground of principle to this conclusion viewed in the light of the apostolic succession, as has been sufficiently explained already. Such presbyter-bishops would have legitimately 'ordained' and fulfilled episcopal functions because those functions would have belonged to the equal commission which they had all received. But later under the teachings of experience this full commission was confined to one 'bishop,' and the rest received the reduced authority which belongs to the presbyterate of later church history. Such a process would not represent the elevation of any new dignity from below but the limitation of an old dignity to one instead of its extension to many, and that in accordance with the precedent set by the Apostle St. John. 'Monepiscopacy' takes the place of a diffused episcopacy.[1] It has however been pointed out that this supposition does not satisfy all the evidence of Clement's letter or of the *Shepherd*. It should also be added that it makes the strong tradition of the monepiscopal succession which meets us in the latter part of the second century, and the undisputed supremacy of the single bishop, almost unintelligible.

(ii) the bishop hidden in the presbyterate;

Secondly, there is a view based on the consideration that long after the existence of bishops in every church, as distinct from presbyters, the term presbyter could still be used for both orders, as it is occasionally

[1] So Dr. Langen states the principle *Gesch. der röm. Kirche* i. p. 95, and Lightfoot (*Ignat.* i. p. 376 n.[1]) expresses agreement with him.

by Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Consequently it is maintainable that in the Church of Clement's day and of Polycarp's there existed, at Corinth and at Philippi, one amongst the presbyters, who, though he held the unique powers which afterwards belonged to the episcopate, was still included under the common name.[1] While, however, this view cannot be disproved, it must be admitted that it is unsupported by the evidence of the documents we have been considering.

(iii) the gradual localization of apostolic men—the best supported view.

The conclusion which on the whole we have been led to form is that the supreme power did not, in the West any more than in the East, ever devolve upon the presbyters. There was a time when they were in many places (as for instance at Corinth and Philippi) the chief *local* authorities—the sole ordinary occupants of the chief seat. But over them, not yet localized, were men either of prophetic inspiration or of apostolic authority and known character—'prophets' or 'teachers' or 'evangelists' or 'rulers'—who in the subapostolic age ordained to the sacred ministry and in certain cases would have exercised the chief teaching and governing authority. Gradually these men, after the pattern set by James in Jerusalem or by John for the churches of Asia, became themselves local presidents or instituted others in their place. Thus a transition was effected to a state of things in which every church had its local president, who ranked amongst the presbytery—a fellow-presbyter, like St. Peter—sitting with them on the chief seat, but to whom was assigned exclusively the name of 'bishop.' This transference and limitation of a name can hardly be a difficulty when we remember the vague use of official titles which meets

[1] Dr. Salmon writes (*Introd.* p. 576): 'It has been thought that although Clement's letter exhibits the prominence of a single person as chief in the Church of Rome, it affords evidence that there was no such prominence in the Church of Corinth. . . . But this inference is not warranted.'

us in early church history. In the organization, as in the theology, of the Church nomenclature was only gradually fixed.[1] The view here expressed of the development of the ministry, besides appearing to account for all the phenomena of the documents of the period, has the great advantage of accounting also for the strength of the tradition which gave authority to the episcopal successions when they first come into clear view, and for the unquestioned position which they held.[2] There is no trace of elevation in the records of the episcopate.

[1] Cf. Theodoret on 1 Tim. iii. 1: τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐκάλουν τότε καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ ἐπισκόπους, τοὺς δὲ νῦν καλουμένους ἐπισκόπους ἀποστόλους ὠνόμαζον· τοῦ δὲ χρόνου προϊόντος, τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀποστολῆς ὄνομα τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἀποστόλοις κατέλιπον, τὴν δὲ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς προσηγορίαν τοῖς πάλαι καλουμένοις ἀποστόλοις ἐπέθεσαν. The idea that bishops were at first called apostles is derived by Theodoret from Theodore Mops. on 1 Tim. iii. 8. There is no early evidence to support it, though there were 'apostles' besides the Twelve. In other respects, however, Theodore's account of the development of the ministry is very interesting. Timothy and Titus represent, he thinks, a class of subapostolic church rulers, who were put in charge of 'provinces' or large districts, and held the supreme control with the authority to ordain, while the local churches were ruled by presbyter-bishops: afterwards the increase in the number of the faithful led to the multiplication of the chief rulers, and their unwillingness to equal themselves to the Apostles led to their adoption of the name of bishops: in later days the episcopate, especially in parts of the East, had come to be unduly multiplied. See Swete *Theodore of Mops. on the Minor Epp. of St. Paul*, ii. pp. 118-125.

[2] We should still have to acknowledge a little idealizing in Tertullian's statement (*de Praescr.* 36) that the local episcopate at Corinth and Philippi was of apostolic institution.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND APPLICATIONS

THE task which remains for us is that of endeavouring to sum up the conclusions of a long investigation.

The verdict of history on the Church;

It appeared first of all that the record of history renders it practically indisputable that Jesus Christ founded a visible society or Church, to be the organ of His Spirit in the world, the depository of His truth, the covenanted sphere of His redemptive grace and discipline. Now such a society, as by its very nature it is to be universal and continuous, must have links of connexion; and in the uninterrupted history of the Church, as it is spread out before us from the latter part of the second century, one such link has always existed in the apostolic successions of the ministry.[1] It appeared further that these successions have been regarded by the church writers, with an unanimity and to an extent which hardly admit of being exaggerated, as an essential element of her corporate life. Of course an essential ministry is a sacerdotal conception. Accordingly reasons have been given for believing that ideas now current as to the growth of sacerdotalism in the early centuries are greatly exaggerated. Undoubtedly there has been a certain growth and development in this respect,

the apostolic succession:

sacerdotalism;

[1] On the fundamental principle of the ministry I should like to take this last opportunity of referring to the *Theologia Naturalis* of Raymund of Sabunde, a very interesting theologian of the fifteenth century; cf. tit. 303: 'quia vita spiritualis consistit in charitate et unitate, ideo convenientissime debuit ordinari, ut homines vice Christi administrent sacramenta salutis hominibus, ut magis fierent unum inter se.'

and the causes of it are not far to seek. The ministry existed in order to govern, and the lawlessness which made government necessary made the assertion of its authority more emphatic. Again,—and this is a point on which it is worth while to lay a good deal of emphasis,—the growing secularity of the Church, consequent upon the popular acceptance of the Christian religion becoming increasingly easy, led inevitably to stress being laid, where there was special need and opportunity to lay it, upon the sanctity requisite for the clergy in their ministerial relation to God. Thus, no doubt, the gulf broadened between the clergy and laity; for, as the gulf is narrowest where the general level of Christian life and aspiration is highest, so the lowering of the average tone tends to the isolation of the priesthood of the ministry. Thus it would be impossible to deny a growth in the sacerdotal conceptions of the Church, but it is a growth which (as has been said) is very easily exaggerated. At least there antedated it the belief (which appears in the latter part of the second century with all the force of an immemorial tradition) that a ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, of apostolic descent and divine authorization, is the centre of unity in each local Christian society, and that the bishop is charged with the administration of that worship and discipline, and with the guardianship of that doctrine, which belong to the whole Church. The chief authority lay with the bishop, and accordingly episcopal ordination was regarded—without a single exception which can be alleged on reasonable grounds—as essential to constitute a man a member of the clergy and give him ministerial commission. Thus what is commonly understood to be meant by the doctrine of the apostolic succession was a commonplace among Christian ideas, and was bound up with the whole fabric of the life of

episcopal ordination.

the catholic Church. Nor would this position be affected if we were to accept Jerome's testimony—though grave reasons were shown in the third chapter against accepting it—to the effect that in the early church of Alexandria, on the vacancy of the see, one of the presbyters succeeded to the episcopate after mere election by his fellows. This would only mean that the Alexandrian presbyters were by the terms of their ordination bishops *in posse*, even though their exercise of episcopal powers, without special election, would have been irregular and would not therefore, according to current teaching, have been accepted as valid. It would not mean—it was not understood by Jerome to mean—that a presbyter who had been ordained without any special conditions attached to his charge could advance himself under any circumstances to episcopal functions. This supposed arrangement would not, therefore, have touched the principle of the succession, viz. that no ecclesiastical ministry can be validly exercised except such as is covered by a clearly understood commission, received in the regular devolution of ecclesiastical authority.

Was, then, this position which the Church took up about her orders justified by the original intentions of its Founder and His Apostles?

The witness of the Gospels;

In answer to this we were led to see that, however much ambiguity might attach to the record of the four Gospels if they were isolated documents, they certainly appear to warrant, if not to require, the position that Christ instituted in His Church a permanent and official apostolate.

the apostolic records.

Further the early records of the apostolic age present us with a picture of the Church governed by such an apostolate, invested without any doubt with a supernatural authority. As the Church grows, a local ministry of presbyter-bishops and deacons is

developed in the different churches. These local officers appear as sharing the apostolic ministry, though in subordinate grades, and as instituted by apostolic authority. It is only by giving the evidence of the *Didache* an importance denied to that of the Pastoral Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and Clement's Epistle, that the idea of a ministry elected simply by the congregation can find any countenance; and though the *Didache* taken by itself would admit of this interpretation, it does not require it. At the period then represented by the Pastoral Epistles—when the Apostle St. Paul is writing especially about church organization and in view of the future—the church ministry consisted of presbyter-bishops and deacons, controlled by the superior authority of apostles and apostolic men.

Earlier the rich miraculous endowments of the Church—endowments which witnessed to the reality of the Spirit's presence, which was ministered by apostolic hands—had more or less thrown into the background the more normal and permanent 'gift of government': but at every stage the Church is presented to us as a highly articulated body in which every member has his own position and function by divine appointment. It is certain that supernatural indications of the divine will in regard to any particular person would have rendered official appointment in accordance with such indications a very subordinate matter; but the force to be attributed to supernatural qualifications recognised by the community is not a practical question in reference to the later church ministry, nor did it appear probable that even such qualifications were allowed (in the case for instance of those prophets and teachers who shared the apostolic authority) to dispense with an appointment to office received either directly from Christ or from His Apostles.

The links between the apostolic ministry and the episcopate.

The question then arose: What are the links of connexion between the apostolic ministry as it is presented to us in the Pastoral Epistles and the ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons as it appears in church history? In particular do the single bishops in each community represent simply a localization of the authority of apostles, prophets, and teachers, which had been catholic or general, while the title 'bishop' was transferred from the lower to the higher grade of office: or was it the case that such apostolic authority as was needed for the permanent government of the Church passed first to the local colleges of equal presbyter-bishops, and that after a time the general governing authority was confined to one only who was called 'bishop' by a limitation of the term—the rest receiving the reduced commission of presbyters?

In answer to this question it appeared that the latter hypothesis can indeed be defended in the case of certain parts of the Church, especially on the evidence of the Epistle of Polycarp and of Jerome's statements about the church of Alexandria, and that it is a hypothesis which in view of its common reception in the West it would be impossible to condemn as if it contradicted the principle of the apostolic succession: but it appeared also that the former alternative is by far the more probable. It has on its side the evidence of the history of the ministry in Palestine, Syria, and Asia, and also, on closer inspection, the evidence which the Epistle of Clement gives us as to the development of the Church at Rome and Corinth; while it is not incompatible with the witness of Polycarp's letter. Thus the presbyters seem never to have held the powers later known as episcopal; but as church after church gained a local representative of apostolic authority, the title of bishop was very naturally confined in its

use to distinguish this 'successor of the Apostles' among the local 'presbyters' with whom he was associated.

It is, however, necessary to emphasize once again that there is considerable room for uncertainty as to the exact steps by which in this place or that the apostolic ministry passed into the ordinary ministry of the Church. But there are matters of much more importance as to which there is no such uncertainty :—

(1) The ministry advanced always upon the principle of succession, so that whatever functions a man held in the Church at any time were simply those that had been committed to him by some one among his predecessors who had held the authority to 'give orders' by regular devolution from the Apostles or 'apostolic men.'

(2) 'It was by a common instinct that this [the threefold or episcopal] organization was everywhere adopted. It was as it were a law of the being of the Church that it should put on this form, which worked as surely as the growth of a particular kind of plant from a particular kind of seed. Everywhere there was a development which made unerringly for the same goal. This seems to speak of divine institution almost as plainly as if our Lord had in so many words prescribed this form of church government. He, the founder, the creator of the Church, would seem to have impressed upon it this nature.'[1]

The doctrine of apostolic succession alone satisfies all the evidence.

Mr. Darwin, writing about his theory of the process of evolution in nature, uses these words : 'I fully admit that there are very many difficulties not satisfactorily explained by my theory of descent with modification, but I cannot possibly believe that a false theory would explain so many classes of facts

[1] Stanton *Christian Ministry Historically Considered* in *Lectures on Church Doctrine*, series iii, pp. 16, 17. I have altered the tenses to adapt the quotation to the context, but with no change of sense.

as I think it certainly does explain. On these grounds I drop my anchor, and believe that the difficulties will slowly disappear.'[1] It is interesting to notice what grounds of evidence a great scientific teacher thinks adequate to support a far-reaching doctrine: and it is impossible not to perceive what far stronger grounds we have for our theory of the apostolic succession. It not only 'explains many classes of facts,' but it, and it only (though of course the cogency of the positive evidence for it is different at different stages), appears to explain all the phenomena of the Christian ministry from the beginning. We, then, have better cause to 'drop our anchor.'

Application of the principle

It is not proposed to carry very far the application of the principles which have been enunciated and defended in this book. It is not for instance proposed to discuss whether such and such Churches or religious bodies which call themselves episcopal have really the historical succession, nor on the other hand to investigate the theories of ordination, more or less subversive, which have been current since the Reformation. But it will appear at once as a consequence of all this argument that the various presbyterian and congregationalist organizations, however venerable on many and different grounds, have, in dispensing with the episcopal successions, violated a fundamental law of the Church's life. It cannot be maintained that the acts of ordination, by which presbyters of the sixteenth or subsequent centuries originated the ministries of some of these societies, were covered by their commission or belonged to the office of presbyter which they had duly received. Beyond all question they 'took to themselves' these powers of ordination, and consequently had them

(*a*) to invalidate non-episcopal ministries;

[1] *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* ii. p. 217. Cf. p. 286: 'It seems to me that an hypothesis is *developed* into a theory solely by explaining an ample lot of facts.'

not. It is not proved—nay, it is not perhaps even probable—that any presbyter had in any age the power to ordain. But it is absolutely certain that for a large number of centuries it had been understood beyond all question that only bishops could ordain and that presbyters had not episcopal powers; and no exceptional dignity belonging to any presbyter-abbot had ever enabled him to transcend the limits of his office. It follows then—not that God's grace has not worked, and worked largely, through many an irregular ministry where it was exercised or used in good faith, but—that a ministry not episcopally received is invalid, that is to say, falls outside the conditions of covenanted security and cannot justify its existence in terms of the covenant.

This conclusion once accepted has of course an immediate bearing on the obligations of individuals who may find themselves members of presbyterian or congregationalist bodies; but it has also another and more general bearing on the relation of large communities of Christians to the properly constituted Church. How can you suppose, such communities indignantly ask, that we can accept conclusions which would falsify the prolonged experience we have had in our Churches of the systematic action of the grace of God? The answer to such pleading is surely this. We do not ask you to deny any spiritual experience of the past or the present. The blame for separations lies, on any fair showing, quite sufficiently with the Church, to make it intelligible that God should have let the action of His grace extend itself widely and freely beyond its covenanted channels. We ask you then to be false to no part of experience but rather to be more completely true to experience in all its aspects. For must you not admit that viewed on the whole the results of our divisions have been disastrous; that the present state of Christendom is

(the bearing on this of present experience)

intolerable? Let me quote the very serious words of an eminent presbyterian theologian:[1]

'If it be the duty of the Church to represent her Lord among men, and if she faithfully perform that duty, it follows by an absolutely irresistible necessity that the unity exhibited in His person must appear in her. She must not only be one, but visibly one in some distinct and appreciable sense—in such a sense that men shall not need to be told of it, but shall themselves see and acknowledge that her unity is real. No doubt such unity may be, and is, consistent with great variety—with variety in the dogmatic expression of Christian truth, in regulations for Christian government, in forms of Christian worship, and in the exhibition of Christian life. It is unnecessary to speak of these things now. Variety and the right to differ have many advocates. We have rather at present to think of unity and the obligation to agree. As regards these, it can hardly be denied that the Church of our time is flagrantly and disastrously at fault. The spectacle presented by her to the world is in direct and palpable contradiction to the unity of the person of her Lord; and she would at once discover its sinfulness were she not too exclusively occupied with the thought of positive action on the world, instead of remembering that her primary and most important duty is to afford to the world a visible representation of her Exalted Head. In all her branches, indeed, the beauty of unity is enthusiastically talked of by her members, and not a few are never weary of describing the precious ointment in which the Psalmist beheld a symbol of the unity of Israel. Others, again, alive to the uselessness of talking where there is no corresponding reality, seek comfort in the thought that beneath all the divisions of the Church there is a unity which she did not make, and which she cannot unmake. Yet, surely, in the light of the truth now before us, we may well ask whether either the talking or the suggested comfort brings us nearer a solution of our difficulties. The one is so meaningless that the very lips which utter it might be expected to refuse their office. The other is true, although, according as it is used, it may either be a stimulus to amendment or a pious platitude; and generally it is the latter. But neither words about the beauty of unity nor the fact of an invisible unity avail to help us. What the Church ought to possess is a unity which the eye can see. If she is to be a witness to her Risen Lord, she must do more than talk of unity, more than console herself with the hope that the world will not forget the invisible bond by which it is pleaded that all her members are bound together into one. Visible unity in one form or another is an essential mark of her faithfulness. . . . The world will never be converted by a disunited Church. Even Bible circulation and missionary exertion upon the largest scale will be powerless to convert it, unless they are accompanied by the strength which unity

[1] Dr. Milligan *Resurrection of our Lord* pp. 199-202 [ed. 2, pp. 204-207].

alone can give. Let the Church of Christ once feel, in any measure corresponding to its importance, that she is the representative of the Risen Lord, and she will no longer be satisfied with mere outward action. She will see that her first and most imperative duty is to heal herself, that she may be able to heal others.'

This is strong pleading. And, if it be the case that we are bound to seek organic unity; if it be the case that the results of our past divisions, of our past individualism, are such as to satisfy us that there has been something fundamentally wrong about current conceptions of Christian liberty and Christian progress; if, further, it be the case that new moral and doctrinal perils, consequent upon the collapse of Christian discipline and accompanied with the 'shaking' of established institutions in all directions, are constantly pressing upon us the obligation to consider afresh the basis of Christian life and order,—all this coincides to give new force and meaning to the claims of the apostolic succession.

For it alone, embodying as it does the principle of the historical continuity of the Church, affords a possible basis of union: it alone, while on the one hand it cannot possibly be abandoned, and while the churches which possess it cannot be asked[1] (if there be anything in this argument) to regard it as simply one of many permissible forms of church government, on the other hand is not, when taken in its true breadth and in all its possibilities of application, open to objection as if it were itself inadequate or unsatisfactory.[2]

(*b*) to recall episcopal Churches to their true principles.

Nor is it the case that in this matter the Anglican Church is simply asking for a cause to be decided all her own way; for she has herself—to say nothing of other portions of the Church—much to do to recall

[1] As Dr. Milligan would I suppose ask them. Some words imply this, in the context from which I have quoted.

[2] I had occasion to point out before that episcopacy is a much wider principle than has sometimes been supposed by both its friends and its enemies. Episcopacy is not necessarily mediaeval or Anglican 'prelacy': see above pp. 62 ff., 89 ff.

herself to her true principles. God's promise to Judah was that she should remember her ways and be ashamed, when she should receive her sisters Samaria and Sodom: and that He would give them her 'for daughters, but not by her covenant':[1] and certainly, if it were granted to the English Church to become a centre for the reunion of separated communities on the basis of the apostolic succession, the words 'not by her covenant' would need to be brought to memory.

To take only one example of this out of several which suggest themselves. The principle of the apostolic succession involves the truth that the bishops of the catholic Church are clothed with a spiritual authority, and a corresponding responsibility, as the guardians of Christian truth and worship and discipline, an authority and a responsibility which they cannot alienate from themselves, or commit to the secular government, without treason to their great Head. God in fact has instituted two kinds of societies in the world—coincident but distinct—the ministers of each representing His authority in their own sphere: indeed in one aspect the record of Christian history is the record of the divine overruling of various attempts on the part of one of these two authorities to deny to the other its independent existence. The early Christian Church recognised without hesitation that 'the powers that be are ordained of God,' but on the other hand the secular power alarmed at the growth of the new spiritual society—the *imperium in imperio*—endeavoured to crush out the Church. At a later epoch, when the balance of powers had changed, the great writers of the middle age acknowledged side by side the Holy Church and the Holy Empire, but in the climax of its might the papacy would not be satisfied with less

[1] Ezek. xvi. 61.

than the annihilation of the independence of the State. Once more an attempt was made which is specially identified with the history of the English Church and race, so to emphasize the idea of a Christianized nation that Church and State could be regarded as only different aspects of the same society. On the basis of such a theory, if the State pledged itself to the Church's faith, the Church on its side might be content to merge its independent governmental authority in that of the State.

The logic of events falsified in turn each of these attempts to fuse the distinct spheres of 'the two empires.' If circumstances have made it absurd in England now to speak of the nation as committed to the catholic faith or of its national courts as 'spiritual,'[1] then circumstances have taught us also how dangerous it was for the Church to go even as far as it did in alienating its power of independent action. In the future it must be content to act first of all as part and parcel of the catholic Church, ruled by its laws, empowered by its Spirit. And, if the bishops are to make an intelligible claim, they must make it as the responsible guardians, by Christ's appointment and apostolic succession, of the doctrine and discipline and worship of the Church catholic, ready to maintain, at all cost, the inherent spiritual independence which belongs to their office.

If then this be the case, the English Church has to learn as well as to teach—to recover a principle as well as to maintain it. For it admits of no question that, for instance, the Established Church in Scotland, though it is presbyterian, has maintained more successfully than the Church of England with her

[1] As Hooker pleaded (*E. P.* viii. 8. 9): 'If the cause be spiritual, secular courts do not meddle with it: we need not excuse ourselves with Ambrose, but boldly and lawfully we may refuse to answer before any civil judge in a matter which is not civil, so that we do not mistake the nature either of the cause or of the court.' The supreme tribunals in ecclesiastical affairs at present established by our laws are 'secular' and 'civil,' not spiritual.

catholic succession the spiritual independence of Christ's society.[1] We have to learn, then, as well as to teach.

But the object of this book was only to maintain a principle; and I should desire to have left before the minds of my readers the picture of an universal spiritual society, in which the apostolic succession of the bishops constitutes by divine appointment a visible link between different epochs, witnessing everywhere to that permanent element in human nature to which Christ's Gospel appeals,—that fundamental humanity, underlying all developments and variations, in virtue of which there becomes possible a real spiritual continuity between the generations, so that 'the heart of the fathers is turned to the children and the heart of the children to the fathers, lest God come and smite the earth with a curse.'

[1] See the remarkable decisions of the Judges of the Court of Session quoted in the *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts*, 1883, vol. ii. p. 46.

APPENDED NOTES.

A.

DR. LIGHTFOOT'S DISSERTATION ON 'THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.'[1]

THE Church at large owes Dr. Lightfoot a debt of gratitude so (in the strictest sense of the term) incalculable—I do not say as Bishop of Durham, for that consideration would be out of place here, but as an historical critic of the very first order, as a defender of the faith, and as an interpreter of St. Paul—and, more than this, any would-be vindicator of the Christian ministry owes so great a debt to the scholar who has again set almost beyond the reach of cavil the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles, that, in venturing to say a word in criticism of what he wrote and confirmed with his mature approval,[2] one runs a great risk of incurring the charge both of arrogance and of ingratitude.

Yet there is no doubt that the Essay named above has caused a great deal of disquiet and confusion: it has been found an effective instrument in defence of 'Congregational principles' by their ablest advocate;[3] and, though all this may have been due in most part, as Dr. Lightfoot urged, to its 'partial and qualifying statements' being 'emphasized to the neglect of the general drift of the Essay,'[4] it does seem to justify such misinterpretations (if I may so speak) by the great ambiguity of the position which it takes up.

This was made all the more apparent by a subsequent statement of the author, that he recognised in Dr. Langen (the distinguished Old-Catholic divine) one who 'gives an account of the origin of episcopacy precisely similar to' his own, 'as set forth in this Essay' *i.e.* the Essay now under discussion.[5] But Dr. Langen's account of the matter[6] is given in complete accordance with the principle of the apostolic succession as contended for above. He never speaks as if

[1] See his *Epistle to the Philippians* pp. 181 ff.
[2] See the Preface to the Sixth Edition (1881).
[3] R. W. Dale's *Manual of Congregational Principles*, appendix p. 216.
[4] Pref. to Sixth Edition.
[5] *Ignatius* i. p. 376 note [1].
[6] *Geschichte der römischen Kirche* i. p. 95 f.

the Church created her ministry originally, or created subsequently a new office of the episcopate by elevation from below.[1] He speaks of the episcopate as always handed down from the Apostles, and simply recognises, whether rightly or no, that, having been originally held by all the presbyters, at least in the West, it subsequently was limited to one. It is obvious that the same facts may admit of being expressed under either phraseology, though not with equal regard to their real significance. I am not now concerned with the facts. My point here is only this, that Dr. Lightfoot's expression of complete agreement with Dr. Langen indicates that he ignores what to many people seems the question of primary importance, viz., *what principles regulated the devolution and development of the ministry*. The question is not one of archæology only, but of principle. The principles which find expression in church history are at least as important as the facts in which they are expressed. It is fatal to neglect either one or the other. Dr. Lightfoot's facts may be perfectly true, but he may still err by ignoring the spirit which was at work in them.

I venture then to point out the main defects (as they seem to me) in this celebrated Dissertation.

(1) First, then, the Dissertation seems to be misleading by giving countenance to a popular confusion of thought, of serious result in religious matters. Men confuse two quite different antitheses. There is the antithesis of what is essential and what is unessential; there is the antithesis of means and ends. In religion the latter antithesis is of vital importance. There is only one *end* in religion. That is the actual restoration of man into the image of God, and therefore into unimpeded fellowship with God. To this end all else is a means—all sacraments and means of grace, all spiritual discipline and effort; amongst other instrumentalities the ministry. Dr. Lightfoot is therefore perfectly right in warning us against 'exalting means into ends' (p. 184).

But he appears to countenance a misleading confusion between *means* and *unessentials*. 'It was against this false principle,' he says, 'that [the Apostles] waged war; the principle which exalted the means into an end, and gave an absolute intrinsic value to subordinate aids and expedients. These aids and expedients, for his own sake and for the good of the society to which he belonged, a Christian could not afford to hold lightly or neglect. But they were no part of the *essence* of God's message to man in the Gospel.' Here Dr. Lightfoot implies that in recognising anything to be a means, not an end, we are recognising it, at the last resort, as *not of the essence*. He is not, of course, using *essence* in any metaphysical sense, but in such sense as that what is essential is equivalent to what is necessary, to what is of *primary* authority and importance. Are there not then such things as

[1] *Dissertation* p. 196: 'The episcopate was formed . . . out of the presbyteral order by elevation.'

essential means? Do we say in the natural region that medicine and the ministry of healing are unessential because they are only means to an end beyond themselves—namely, health? No; they are essential means. Now, what is Christianity in the supernatural region? What did Christ send His Apostles to do? To announce the true end of human life—the true ideal on which our eyes must always be fixed? Most certainly; but not only—perhaps not chiefly—to do this. Their duty was at least as primarily to call people's attention to the means which God had 'devised that His banished be not expelled from Him' (2 Sam. xiv. 14). Christ had established a kingdom or Church; and this, with its sacraments and its social obligations, was the divinely appointed — the essential or necessary — means to the great end. *Christianity is as much the establishment of a visible system of means for realizing the end of human life, as it is the divine announcement of what that end is.*

There are in Christianity, therefore, essential means—means, that is, not devised by men as the gradual outcome of their experienced needs, but ordained by Christ in anticipation of them. This, of course, Dr. Lightfoot would admit—though his language at times[1] would suggest the false notion, on which enough has been said, that Christianity came into the world as a bare ideal. But at least he would admit that Baptism and the Lord's Supper were divinely appointed means 'generally necessary to salvation.'[2] Now these are social sacraments; they are parts of a social system; they involve the truth that Christ has instituted a 'kingdom of means,' a visible channel for His covenanted gifts of grace. Well then, if this be so, no new principle will be involved, supposing the evidence goes to show that Christ instituted a ministry of truth and grace in His kingdom, intended to be a permanent link of continuity and bond of unity in it. This ministry becomes one of the 'means which God devised.' But, strangely enough, the question is never faced; did Christ institute a ministry in the persons of His Apostles, and did they perpetuate it? Dr. Lightfoot says: 'it became necessary to appoint special officers,' 'it became necessary to provide for the emergency by definite officers' (p. 184). Was the Church ever without special officers constituted by divine appointment in the Apostles? Was not the household divinely planned so as to include commissioned stewards?

I cannot see how Dr. Lightfoot, accepting the Gospels, the Acts, and the Pastoral Epistles, can answer in the negative. But what I am calling attention to here is simply that he has not put the clear issue before us. He speaks in the earlier part of his Essay as if all the means for realizing the great ideal of humanity presented to us in Christ

[1] See *Dissertation* pp. 181, 182.

[2] But, if this is so, then the proposition that 'Christianity has no special sanctuaries' is at least misleading (p. 181). A Christian, to continue such, must participate in a sacramental 'breaking of bread,' which must be a local act, and which constitutes the place where it is celebrated, without more ado, a local sanctuary.

were left to man's devising, and were therefore matter only of spiritual expediency. But he is pledged to admit 'necessary means,' at the least in the two sacraments; and these spoil his whole theory. They involve the institution by Christ of a kingdom of means. They force us to put another question to ourselves, and not that which he suggests to us, viz., *Granted a kingdom of necessary means, is a ministry among them?*

(2) Dr. Lightfoot repudiates strenuously and rightly certain falsely sacerdotal conceptions (pp. 181, 182). He also admits the existence in the Church of a priesthood rightly so called (pp. 182, 266, 267). Confessedly in this controversy a good deal is matter of words; something has been said on it above, and something on its historical aspect will be said further on. But here again the fundamental questions are, in the Dissertation, hardly put to us. Did Christ institute a ministry of sacred things—call it a priesthood or not—in such sense that the members of His Church were bound to avail themselves of it, and by this very obligation were given a centre and bond of unity? Dr. Lightfoot is at liberty to call Ignatius and Irenaeus unsacerdotal (pp. 250, 252); he is at liberty to quote Ambrosiaster as giving 'a singularly appreciative account of the relation of the ministry to the congregation' (p. 185 note[1]). But these writers would have answered this question with a most unhesitating affirmative; they undoubtedly believed in the necessary subordination of every one who would be a Christian to the episcopal ministry which represented the divine authority in the Church by succession from the Apostles; they would not have recognised as a brother any one who was separated from the Church of the bishops. We go back to the apostolic age. Here, again, any one is at liberty to note that the ministry is not called a priesthood; but he must recognise that there was a ministry, and that it had special powers. For could any Christian receive the gift of the Holy Ghost except by the laying-on of apostolic hands? Could any zealous Cretan become a presbyter except by Titus' ordination? The sort of 'unsacerdotalism' which nevertheless makes an exclusive claim for an ordained ministry is not what is wanted by anti-sacerdotalists of our day. Thus, as we read this portion of Dr. Lightfoot's Essay, we feel constantly drawn to 'move the previous question.' Was there ever a time in church history when men, who deserted the authoritative ministry and set up one of their own outside the due succession, would have been regarded as still within the covenant? Was it ever a recognised principle in the Church that an unordained Christian even at the last resort could celebrate the Eucharist? I shall endeavour to answer these questions in the ensuing chapters. My present object is not to discuss the facts so much as to point out where, I think, Dr. Lightfoot tends to ignore the primary questions at issue.

B.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE ALEXANDRIAN MINISTRY: THE EVIDENCE OF EUTYCHIUS.

(*See pp.* 115-130, *especially p.* 118.)

JEROME'S statement (*Ep.* cxlvi *ad Evangelum*) is as follows: 'Alexandriae a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium episcopos presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant; quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat, aut diaconi eligant de se quem industrium noverint et archidiaconum vocent. Quid enim facit excepta ordinatione episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat?'

These are his words. The parallel found in the military election might suggest a doubt as to his meaning, but the illustration from the election of an archdeacon seems plain. So at least thought the author of the *de Divinis Officiis* (wrongly attributed to Alcuin), who quotes Jerome's words and comments thus: 'Archidiaconus eandem consecrationem habet quam ceteri diaconi, sed electione fratrum praeponitur' (ap. Hittorp. p. 74 [ed. 1591, p. 63]); so also Amalarius, bishop of Treves A.D. 809-814, *de Eccles. Off.* ii. 13 (ap. Hittorp. p. 166 [141]): 'Archidiaconi consecratio nobis notissima est; archidiaconus eandem consecrationem habet quam ceteri diaconi, sed electione fratrum praeponitur.' They both treat this state of things at Alexandria as an instance of a substantial original identity in the office of bishops and priests, indicated by the same officers being called in the New Testament by either name. This comes to them from Jerome and Ambrosiaster, whom they quote.[1]

In contemporary Greek writers we get no hint of what Jerome mentions. We learn indeed from Epiphanius that 'all the churches belonging to the catholic Church in Alexandria were under one archbishop, but presbyters were appointed over them individually to supply the ecclesiastical necessities of the inhabitants who lived in the neighbourhood of each church' (*Haer.* lxix. 1). Thus in his day the presbyters at Alexandria had the relative independence of later parish priests.[2] Of anything beyond this in the past we get no hint.

But an Arab historian is quoted to confirm Jerome. Sa'id Ibn Batrik, Melkite patriarch of Alexandria A.D. 933-943—who took

[1] See further App. Note F, pp. 335-339, and above, pp. 156-161.

[2] This is all that Epiphanius says. Is it fairly represented by Dr. Bigg's 'Even in the time of Epiphanius they exercised a sort of episcopal jurisdiction' (*B. L.* p. 40: ed. 2, p. 67)? It is the existence of these 'parishes' in the Alexandrian 'diocese' which accounts for Eusebius' language in *H. E.* v. 22: τῶν κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν παροικιῶν τὴν λειτουργίαν ἐγχειρίζεται Δημήτριος, and vi. 35; μεταλλάξαντος Ἡρακλᾶ τὸν βίον ἐπὶ δέκα ἓξ ἔτεσι τῆς προστασίας τῶν κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐκκλησιῶν. But he uses the former phrase in a more doubtful sense of Irenaeus in v. 23. 3.

the Greek name of Eutychius (though he does not appear to have known Greek) and wrote annals in Arabic from the creation down to his own time—makes the following statements :[1]

'Mark the evangelist appointed, with Hananias the patriarch, twelve presbyters to be with the patriarch, so that when he died they should choose one of the twelve presbyters, and the other eleven should lay their hands on his head and bless him, and make him patriarch. Afterwards they should elect another eminent man and make him presbyter with themselves in place of him who had been made patriarch, that they might always be twelve. And this custom of the twelve presbyters of Alexandria appointing the patriarch out of themselves continued till the time of the patriarch Alexander, who was of the 318 [i.e. Fathers of Nicaea] ; he forbade the presbyters henceforth to appoint the patriarch, and ordered that when the patriarch was dead the bishops should assemble and ordain a patriarch.' He also removed the restriction to elect from among the twelve presbyters. 'Thus ceased the ancient custom of the presbyters appointing the patriarch, and the power of appointing the patriarch came to belong to the bishops.'

'From the time of Hananias to the time of Demetrius, the eleventh patriarch of Alexandria [A.D. 189 to A.D. 231-2], there was no bishop in the provinces of Egypt, nor had the patriarchs who were before him appointed bishops. When Demetrius was made patriarch he appointed three bishops, and he was the first patriarch of Alexandria who made bishops. When he was dead Heraclas was elected in his place, who appointed twenty bishops.'

It will be noticed that Eutychius

(1) supports Jerome's statement, but specifies *twelve* presbyters, and adds that the presbyters *laid on hands*, which Jerome does not say :

(2) makes the arrangement last till Alexander's time, which again contradicts Jerome and is manifestly false :

(3) speaks of 'the patriarch,' which is of course an anachronism :

(4) adds information which, if true, would be very important, viz., that there was only one bishop in Egypt up to the days of Demetrius, who added three, and that his successor Heraclas increased them to twenty.

We cannot tell whence this writer derived his information. No doubt he had access, mediately or immediately, to the same source as lies behind the statements of Jerome and Severus given on pp. 118-123

[1] A portion of the annals was edited first by Selden, under the title *Eutychii Aegyptii Patriarchae Orthodoxorum Alexandrini Ecclesiae suae Origines*, in 1642, in the interests of presbyterianism. He was replied to by a Maronite Father, Abraham Echellensis, in his *Eutychius Vindicatus*, 1661 ; also by Pearson in the *Vindiciae Ignatianae*, 1672. The *Annales*, or *Contextio Gemmarum*, is published in a Latin translation in Migne's *Patrol. Graec.* cxi. col. 907 f. The passages quoted above are from col. 982.

supra. But the probability is very small that any really ancient tradition lies behind such additional facts as he reports about the Alexandrian presbyters and the development of episcopacy in Egypt. The following reasons seem sufficient to prevent our attaching any weight to his unsupported evidence.

(1) He is so ignorant of the period to which he assigns the 'ecclesiastical revolution' caused by the creation of the Egyptian episcopate, that he is actually unaware of the existence at that time of infinitely the most important man of the age—Origen. When he comes to deal with the fifth Council he writes thus:[1] 'There was in the time of Justinian a bishop of Manbag (episcopus Manbagensis), by name Origen, who taught metempsychosis, denying a resurrection. There was also Ibas, bishop of Edessa (Rohensis), Thaddaeus, bishop of Massisa (Massisensis), and Theodoret, bishop of Ancyra, who asserted that the body of our Lord Christ was phantastic and had in itself nothing real.' This will suffice as a specimen of his historical knowledge. Pearson enlarges on his ignorance and blunders (*Vindic. Ignat.* part 1, chap. xi. [ed. Oxford, 1852, p. 294 f.]).

(2) But it may be answered that however ignorant of the Greek church writers, and of church history generally, he may have had access to Alexandrian traditions. Have we reason then to think that his statements represent ancient Egyptian tradition? I think not. Partly because Jerome, had he known what Eutychius relates, would not have kept silence about it. But also—and this is more important—because Severus, bishop of Eshmunain in Egypt, who wrote a history of the Alexandrian patriarchs[2] in the same century as Eutychius (c. A.D. 978) and professes to have consulted Greek and Coptic remains in the monastery of St. Macarius, knows nothing of what Eutychius relates and gives a great many details about the election of early patriarchs quite inconsistent with the supposed position of the twelve presbyters and involving the existence of other bishops. Renaudot complains (*Hist.* p. 23) of Severus' ignorance and doubts his knowledge of Greek, but at least he knows more of the period of Demetrius than Eutychius does. He abuses Origen out of all reason; but he knows his period and his fame as a scholar and writer. Now Severus makes St. Mark ordain *Annianus as bishop, and three presbyters, and seven deacons*, and then proceed into Pentapolis and appoint in many places bishops, priests, and deacons (Evetts pp. 144, 145). He represents Cerdo (the third bishop), as having been elected by bishops and priests with the faithful laity and that too by lot (*ib.* p. 150), and Primus (the fourth) as chosen out of the 'orthodox people,' not from among the presbyters (p. 151), and Celadion (the eighth) as elected by

[1] ap. Migne *tom. cit.* col. 1073.

[2] Condensed by Renaudot into a Latin version *Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum* (Paris, 1713) but now published in the Arabic text, with English translation, by Mr. B. T. A. Evetts (*Patrologia Orientalis* i. 2, 4, v. 1, x. 5, Paris, 1907-1915).

the people with the bishops (p. 153).[1] The only one among the early patriarchs, according to Severus, who was chosen from among the presbyters was the tenth patriarch, Julian. Thus the complete disagreement of the more credible Severus with the statements of Eutychius seems to deprive them of the claim to represent a valid tradition.[2]

(3) Eutychius' information about the absence of bishops in Egypt till the times of Demetrius and Heraclas seems inconsistent with what we know of the history of the period. Photius records,[3] on the authority of Pamphilus, the author of an *Apology for Origen*, the following facts: 'Demetrius' love is turned [by Origen's ordination] into hatred. . . . Moreover, a synod of bishops and some presbyters is gathered together against Origen. And they, as Pamphilus says, vote that Origen should be banished from Alexandria and neither live there nor teach, but that he should not be deposed from the honour of the presbyterate. But Demetrius, with some Egyptian bishops, removed him also from the priesthood, those who had formerly supported him subscribing this decree.' Now about this evidence there are two things to be said In the first place it is scarcely possible to reconcile Pamphilus' statements about a 'synod' and about 'some Egyptian bishops' with the figures given by Eutychius for the Egyptian episcopate under Demetrius. In the second place Pamphilus was an enthusiastic disciple of Origen, and if this synod of bishops who overrode the mixed synod of bishops and presbyters had been a new thing created simply by Demetrius and lacking altogether in constitutional authority, it is very unlikely that we should not have been told so. Nay more, we should surely have been able to catch in Origen's own language about bishops subsequently some tone of disparagement, some hint of novel claims made in the name of episcopal authority; but all his language quoted on pp. 127, 128, dates from the period after his expulsion and deposition.[4] Dr. Bigg speaks of the patriarchate of Demetrius as involving 'the bustle and excitement of a revolution,' and he alludes to 'a usurpation which

[1] Apparently he speaks of the election of Agrippinus the tenth patriarch in these words (Renaudot, *Coll. Lit. Orient.* i. p. 381: Evetts p. 153): 'the people assembled again with one consent, and laid their hands upon a man of the congregation who feared God, and whose name was Agrippinus; and they appointed him patriarch, and set him upon the evangelical throne.' Renaudot thinks this phrase in Severus makes it possible that Eutychius only meant to imply that eleven presbyters '*got* hands laid upon the new patriarch.' This, however, is improbable.

[2] It may be said that still later historians, Georgius Homadius (El-Makin), an Arab Christian who died in 1273, and the Sheikh Taqi-ed-Din El-Maqrizi (fourteenth century —translated by Rev. S. C. Malan in *Original Documents of the Coptic Church*), support Eutychius in different degrees. But the former is said to be made up out of Eutychius (this portion of El-Makin is not edited), and El-Maqrizi undoubtedly depends upon him. 'A gifted man,' he describes him, 'who wrote a useful history' (Malan's translation p. 87).

[3] Photius *Bibliotheca* cod. cxviii. ap. Migne *Patrol. Graec.* ciii. col. 397. Pamphilus was martyred in A.D. 309. The book was completed by his friend Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea.

[4] Nearly all the works of Origen cited in those pages belong to the time of his residence at Caesarea.

lay heavy on the priests.'[1] Now Demetrius died in 231; this 'usurpation' was carried further, according to Jerome, in the episcopates of his successors by the abolition of the old method of appointing bishops. Yet Origen, writing about A.D. 249, speaks of the Alexandrian, among other churches, as characterized by mildness and stability (*πραεῖα καὶ εὐσταθής*, *c. Cels.* iii. 30), and thinks apparently that the fault most likely to be found in bishops and clergy is a want of zeal.[2]

(4) Eutychius' information seems inconsistent with a document which appears to let in light upon the very early days of Egyptian church history. The document generally known as the *Apostolic Church Order* (which is to be distinguished from the later *Apostolic Constitutions* and *Apostolic Canons*) is, as it were, the beginning of the canon law of the Egyptian Church. Its history indicates Egypt as its source, and Harnack, its last editor, rightly remarks that it has a provincial origin.[3] It is a composite document, and appears to contain fragments of very different epochs; some chapters (16-21) on the election of bishops, on presbyters, readers, deacons, and widows, seem to come from very early days.[4] The chapter on the election of a bishop is very curious: 'If there be a paucity of men, and anywhere the number of those able to vote for a bishop *be less than twelve*, let them write to the neighbouring churches, wherever a church happens to be established, that three chosen men having come from thence, and having put to the test him who is worthy—namely if any one have a good report of the heathen, if he be sinless, if he be a lover of the poor, if he be temperate, not a drunkard, not a fornicator, not covetous, nor a railer, nor a respecter of persons, nor such like things: it is good that he should be unmarried, but if not, a husband of one wife; educated, able to interpret the Scriptures, or if unlearned, meek in character, and let him abound in love towards all; lest the bishop come to be convicted in any matter by the multitude.'[5] Here we have

[1] *B. L.* p. 100 [ed. 2 p. 134]: 'the *Stromateis* were written during the patriarchate [episcopate ed. 2] of Demetrius *amid the bustle and excitement of a revolution*'; and p. 110 [p. 155]. Even if the facts as given by the tenth-century writer were correct, it is to be noted that the accompaniments of usurpation and excitement and revolution are wholly the creation of the nineteenth-century writer.

[2] It should be remembered too that in Athanasius' day there were, as he tells us, about a hundred bishops (*ἐγγὺς ἑκατόν*) in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis (*Apol. c. Ar.* 71); and a generation earlier the same number is given in the encyclical letter of Alexander of Alexandria (ap. Soc. *H.E.* i. 6) *ἡμεῖς μετὰ τῶν κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἐπισκόπων καὶ τὰς Λιβύας ἐγγὺς ἑκατὸν ὄντων*. The growth from four when Heraclas acceded (A.D. 232) to one hundred when Alexander wrote (c. A.D. 323) would have been extremely rapid.

[3] *Texte und Untersuch.* Band ii, Heft 2, p. 193 ff. and Heft 5, p. 6.

[4] At latest, Harnack says, 'the first third of the third century' (Heft 2, p. 212). The remarkable position of the 'reader' *above the deacon* to which Harnack calls attention has also to be noticed.

[5] c. 16: . . . *ἐὰν ὀλιγανδρία ὑπάρχῃ καὶ μήπου πλῆθος τυγχάνῃ τῶν δυναμένων ψηφίσασθαι περὶ ἐπισκόπου ἐντὸς δεκαδύο ἀνδρῶν, εἰς τὰς πλησίον ἐκκλησίας, ὅπου τυγχάνει πεπηγυῖα, γραφέτωσαν, ὅπως ἐκεῖθεν τρεῖς ἄνδρες παραγενόμενοι δοκιμῇ δοκιμάσαντες τὸν ἄξιον ὄντα, εἴ τις φήμην καλὴν ἔχει ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν, . . . καλὸν*

popular election, the possibility of illiterate bishops, heathen surroundings, and everything that points to early days and out-of-the-way communities. This makes it all the more noticeable that there is to be a bishop elected even *in communities where there are not twelve voters*. This is better evidence than Eutychius can offer!

On the whole, then, I think it is absurd to take Eutychius as an authority in the way in which some modern writers—notably Dr. Bigg—have done. I believe the evidence would suggest

(1) a widespread episcopacy in Egypt generally, as elsewhere, even in the smallest communities:

(2) a large degree of popular influence in the election down to the Nicene age.

C.

RITES AND PRAYERS OF ORDINATION.

(*See pp.* 131 ff. [Greek] *and* 162 ff. [Latin].)

A. Greek rites of ordination.

I.

The Ordination Prayers of Bishop Serapion (see above, p. 131) are as follows:[1]—

Laying-on of hands of the making (καταστάσεως) *of Deacons.*

Father of the Only-Begotten who didst send Thy Son and didst ordain affairs (πράγματα) on the earth, and hast given rules to the Church and orders (τάξεις) for the help and salvation of the flocks, who didst choose out bishops and presbyters and deacons for the ministry of Thy catholic Church, who didst choose through Thine Only-Begotten the seven deacons, and didst freely give to them Holy Spirit, make also this man a deacon of Thy catholic Church, and give in him a spirit of knowledge and discernment, that he may be able purely and unblameably to do service in this ministry (λειτουργία) in the midst of the holy people, through Thy Only-Begotten Jesus Christ, through whom to Thee (is) the glory and the strength in Holy Spirit both now and to all the ages of the ages. Amen.

Laying-on of hands of the making of Presbyters.

We stretch forth the hand, O Lord God of the Heavens, Father of Thy Only-Begotten, upon this man, and beseech Thee that the

μὲν εἶναι ἀγύναιος, εἰ δὲ μή, ἀπὸ μιᾶς γυναικός· παιδείας μέτοχος, δυνάμενος τὰς γραφὰς ἑρμηνεύειν· εἰ δὲ ἀγράμματος, πραΰς ὑπάρχων . . . μήποτε περί τινος ἐλεγχθεὶς ἐπίσκοπος ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν γενηθείη.

[1] The text here translated is that printed by Brightman in *Journal of Theological Studies* i. 266.

Spirit of Truth may dwell (ἐπιδημήσῃ) upon him. Give him the graces of prudence and knowledge and a good heart. Let a divine Spirit come to him that he may be able to be a steward over Thy people and an ambassador of Thy divine oracles, and to reconcile Thy people to Thee the uncreated God. Thou who didst give of the Spirit of Moses a holy Spirit upon the chosen ones, give a portion of holy Spirit also to this man from the Spirit of the Only-Begotten, for the grace of wisdom and knowledge and right faith, that he may be able to serve Thee in a clean conscience, through Thy Only-Begotten Jesus Christ, through whom (is) to Thee the glory and the strength in Holy Spirit both now and for all the ages of the ages. Amen.

Laying-on of hands of the making of a Bishop.

Thou who didst send the Lord Jesus for the gain of all the world (οἰκουμένης), Thou who didst through Him choose the apostles, Thou who generation by generation dost ordain holy bishops, O God of truth, make also this man a living bishop, a holy[1] bishop of the succession of the holy apostles, and give to him grace and divine Spirit, which Thou didst freely give to all Thy true (γνησίοις) servants and prophets and patriarchs: make him to be worthy to shepherd Thy flock and let him still continue unblameably and without offence in the bishopric, through Thy Only-Begotten Jesus Christ, through whom to Thee (is) the glory and the strength in Holy Spirit both now and to all the ages of the ages. Amen.

II.

The ordination rite from the Barberini MS. of the end of the eighth century (see Brightman *Litt. E. and W.* p. lxxxviii: the MS. is, however, no longer Barb. iii. 55, but Vatic. Barb. gr. 336) is printed in Morinus (*de Sacr. Ord.* pars ii. p. 64 ff.), and is to the following effect:—

(*a*) *For a bishop.* The archbishop reads the declaration of the election: 'the Divine Grace . . . appoints such an one, the well-beloved presbyter, to be bishop.'[2] This he reads 'holding his hand upon the head of him who is being ordained.' Then, after the Kyrie Eleison,

[1] ἅγιον. Perhaps we should read ἄξιον 'worthy.'

[2] This is the ἀνάρρησις ἱερά (pseudo-Dionysius ap. Morinus *de S. O.* pars ii. p. 57). It was made in the case of each order, and means that the consecrator (ἱεροτελεστής) is the *interpreter of the divine election* and does not act by the impulse of his own favour (ἰδίᾳ χάριτι). This emphasis on the choice of divine grace is common to all (apparently) of the oriental rites of ordination.

The rites of ordination, Greek, Latin, and oriental, are given in Morinus *de Sacr. Ord.* pars ii.: for the Coptic see pp. 506-508 (as in the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the Latin rites, the presbyters are compared to the seventy elders); for the Jacobite, pp. 479-488 (it contains directions for impressive solemnity of manner in the consecrating bishop—'manus deprimit tremulas . . . oculis in altum cum timore aspicientibus'—pp. 481, 484, 487): for the Maronite, pp. 396, 404, 419. In this last the idea of succession by laying-on of hands is strangely traced from God on Mount Sinai,

'the archbishop lays the open Gospel on his head and neck (while the other bishops stand by and touch it), and, laying his hand on him, prays thus.' In the prayer he invokes God as having ordained, through his Apostle St. Paul, divers orders for the ministry of His holy mysteries in His sanctuary—apostles, prophets, teachers—and prays Him that the person now elected to pass under the yoke of the Gospel and under the high-priestly dignity, through the laying-on of his and his assistants' hands, by the descent and power and grace of the Holy Spirit, may be strengthened with His holy unction, as prophets of old were strengthened and kings anointed and high-priests consecrated, and may be made a blameless high-priest and intercessor for his people.

Afterwards, intercessions follow, during which the archbishop keeps his hand on the head of him who is being ordained (*τοῦ χειροτονουμένου*) and prays thus: 'O Lord God, who, because the nature of man cannot bear the essence of the Godhead, hast in Thy economy appointed us teachers of like passions with ourselves, occupying Thy seat, to offer Thee sacrifice and offering on behalf of all Thy people, do Thou, O Lord, make this man who has been appointed (*ἀναδειχθέντα*) a steward of the grace of the high-priesthood, an imitator of Thee, the true Pastor, laying down his life for the sheep, being a guide of the blind, a light of those in darkness, an instructor of the ignorant, a light in the world, that having prepared the souls committed to him in this life, he may stand without shame at Thy judgment seat.' Then the archbishop lays the book of the Gospels upon the holy table, and puts the 'omophorion' on him who has been ordained (*τῷ χειροτονηθέντι*), and kisses him, and mounts with him to the common throne (*τὸ σύνθρονον*).

(*b*) *For a presbyter.* 'The archbishop makes three signs of the cross upon his head and, having his hand laid upon him, prays thus': he invokes 'the Ancient of days (*ὁ πάσης κτίσεως πρεσβύτατος ὑπάρχων*) who has dignified with the name of presbyter those who are thought worthy in this grade (*βαθμός*) to minister (*ἱερουργεῖν*) the word of His truth'; and prays Him to bestow on the present chosen person 'this great grace of His Holy Spirit,' that he may walk worthily of the great priestly honour committed to him.

Then intercessions follow, the archbishop holding his hand on the head of 'him who is being ordained' and praying that God will fill

through Moses and Aaron, to John the Baptist, from John the Baptist to Christ, from Christ to His Apostles; cf. Ephraem Syr. *Opp. Syr.* ii. p. 448 [ed. Rom. 1740]. The hierarchy of earth is compared, as by Clement, to the grades of angelic glory. There are distinct rites for the ordination of chorepiscopus, bishop, and patriarch. The prayer for the chorepiscopus speaks of the 'imposition of the Divine Hand' (p. 416), and the concluding prayer in the bishop's ordination speaks of 'the *χειροτονία* which he has this day received' (p. 422), but the ritual direction for the laying-on of hands is only given in the case of the patriarch (p. 429). The NESTORIAN rites are on pp. 445-473. They contain prayers for the gifts of miraculous power—to heal the sick, and generally (pp. 457-465). Throughout all these rites there is the same general conception of the sacerdotal offices—the same conception of laying on apostolic hands, with accompanying prayer, with a view to the obtaining of the grace qualifying or the distinct orders of the ministry.

him, whom He has thought worthy to undertake the office of presbyter, with His Holy Spirit, 'that he may stand blamelessly at His altar, and preach the Gospel of His salvation, and minister (ἱερουργεῖν) the word of His truth, and offer Him gifts and spiritual sacrifices, and renew His people by the laver of regeneration.'

Then he gives him the appropriate dress and the kiss, and later on associates him with himself in the service of the altar.

In a later office (p. 112), the bishop gives the just ordained presbyter the consecrated bread with the words: 'Receive this deposit, and guard it to the coming of our Lord.' In general, with some ritual additions, the rite is unchanged. In the rite of the ordination of a bishop there is a long declaration of faith (pp. 120-124) and the giving of the pastoral staff, but no substantial change in the idea of the service or alteration in the rite and prayer. See Daniel *Codex Liturgicus* iv. pp. 556-563.

B. Latin rites of ordination.

There is an excellent account of these rites s.v. ORDINAL in the *Dict. Chr. Ant.* by Dr. Hatch; and they are described by the same writer at length with elaborate references s.v. ORDINATION. The most exact account of the MSS. of the sacramentaries is M. Delisle's *Mémoire sur d'anciens sacramentaires* [Paris, 1886]. A detailed description, clearly distinguishing the Roman from the Gallican elements of the rite, is given by Mgr. Duchesne *Origines du culte chrétien*, ed. 3 [Paris, 1903] pp. 352-376. We have

(1) Early accounts of the rite of ordination without prayers. Cf. Martene *de Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, ii., Ordo i (ed. Rouen, 1700, p. 337: Antwerp, 1736, p. 86), Ordo ix (ed. Rouen, p. 407: Antwerp, p. 151: given in part ap. Hittorp. *de Div. Cath. Eccl. Off.* p. 88 [ed. 1591, p. 63]; Muratori *Lit. Rom. Vet.* [Venice, 1748] i. col. 512 (the preface to the prayer of benediction).

(2) Early prayers of benediction without any account of the accompanying rites. Cf. Muratori *op. cit.* i. coll. 421 ff. (Leonine), ii. coll. 358 ff. (Gregorian), i. coll. 513 ff. and 622 ff. (Gelasian).

(3) Early rites with the prayers of benediction. Cf. Muratori ii. coll. 405 ff., 415 ff.; Morinus pars ii. pp. 261-341 (Missale Francorum, etc.).

i. *Ordination of presbyters.* This begins with a presentation of the ordinand to the bishop: an address to the people, solemnly asking their assent: sometimes an examination of the ordinand: a declaration of election by the bishop, and a request for common prayer—'commune votum communis oratio prosequatur.' Then follows the ordination—the presbyters with the bishop laying on hands. Of the following prayers the first is in all the forms:

(*a*) A collect (*Oratio*) for the outpouring of the 'benediction of the Holy Spirit and the power of sacerdotal grace' upon him who is 'offered for consecration.'

(*b*) The *Consecratio*. God is invoked as the harmonious dispenser of all the distinctive grades and offices in the world, 'unde sacerdotalis gradus et officia Levitarum sacramentis mysticis instituta creverunt'; special commemoration is made of His having ordained to offices of assistance in His kingdom at every stage 'men of a second order and dignity' (sequentis ordinis, secundae dignitatis): to assist Moses, the seventy elders: to supplement Aaron's priesthood, that of his sons: to accompany the Apostles, 'teachers of the faith,' so that they filled the whole world with these 'second preachers' (that is, apparently, the seventy). So God is implored to give His bishops now—as in their greater weakness they need it the more—the supplementary ministry of the presbyters, and, in particular, to give 'to this His servant the dignity of the presbyterate, to renew in his heart the Spirit of holiness, that he may receive and hold from God the gift of second dignity (secundi meriti munus), and by the example of his conversation set the standard of conduct (censuram morum insinuet), so that he may be the worthy assistant of the bishop (probus, or providus, nostri ordinis cooperator).' These prayers are in the Leonine Sacramentary (which seems to be the earliest that remains: the MS. which contains it, Verona lxxxv, is assigned by Delisle, *Mémoire etc.* p. 65, to the seventh century), in the Gelasian, and in the Gregorian.

(*c*) In the Gallican rite, as reconstructed from the Gelasian MS. (seventh or beginning of eighth century: Wilson *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, Oxford, 1894, p. 24), the Missale Francorum (end of seventh or first half of eighth century, Delisle *op. cit.* p. 72), and other later books, we have first an invitation to prayer, entitled *Consummatio Presbyteri*, for the 'sacerdotal gifts of the Holy Spirit' on the new presbyter. This is followed by the prayer, called *Benedictio*, that he may be all an elder ought to be, in meditation of God's law, in faith, in teaching, in life: 'that he may keep pure and undefiled the gift of God's ministry, and . . . may be transformed into inviolable love and into a perfect man.'[1] Then (in the Missale

[1] This part of the prayer is given by our different authorities in differing forms, of which the least corrupt appears to be that contained in the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert, written at Winchester late in the tenth century (ed. Wilson, *Henry Bradshaw Society* xxiv., 1903, p. 125: it is the 'antiquissimus Rotomagensis ecclesiae . . . codex Anglicanus' of Morinus, p. 282). A critical comparison of the texts suggests that the prayer originally ran somewhat as follows: 'ut purum atque immaculatum ministerii donum custodiat, et [tua benedictione] transformetur ad inviolabilem caritatem, in virum perfectum, in mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi, ut in die iusti et aeterni iudicii conscientia pura, fide plena, Spiritu sancto plenus appareat': and this is what is represented in the translation in the text. But the occurrence of the word 'transformetur' apparently suggested at an early stage the insertion of the reference to the Eucharistic elements, which in one form of phrase or another is found in all our extant authorities, the Winchester Benedictional included. It should be added that, while the Winchester book gives the earliest form of this prayer of benediction, it at the same time betrays its date by the addition of other prayers in which later ideas are present.

Francorum) there is a *Consecratio Manus*—an unction of the presbyter's hands with a prayer, 'ut quaecumque benedixerint benedicta sint et quaecumque sanctificaverint sanctificentur.'[1]

In all this there is no mention of *offering sacrifice*, or of *absolution*. The presbyter is viewed as the assistant of the bishop. But gradual alterations in the ordination of priests tend to emphasize their special sacerdotal functions, and therewith to give them a more independent priesthood. Thus, as an accompaniment to the vesting in the chasuble, a benediction—'ut offeras placabiles hostias pro peccatis atque offensionibus populi omnipotenti Deo'—appears in the Codex S. Eligii (ninth or tenth century; Morinus p. 270, Delisle p. 175). So in the Anglo-Saxon MS. of eleventh century (Morinus p. 282 ff.), which also adds in the *Consecratio Manus*—'ad consecrandas hostias quae pro delictis atque negligentiis populi offeruntur'; cf. a Sens MS. (tenth century, *ib.* p. 294 ff.) and the Codex Ratoldi (tenth century, *ib.* p. 298 ff.). In a twelfth (?) century MS. (*ib.* p. 329 ff.) appears the *porrectio instrumentorum* with 'Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo missamque celebrare tam pro vivis quam et pro defunctis in nomine Domini.' Lastly in thirteenth century MSS. (Morinus pp. 338,340) we have the 'Accipe Spiritum sanctum; quorum remiseritis peccata etc.'

On the newly ordained presbyters concelebrating with the bishop, see Morinus *op. cit.* pars iii. ex. viii. cap. i. (p. 158).

ii. *Ordination of a bishop.* In Martene's Ordo i. (*op. cit.* ii. p. 87) we have provisions for securing that the bishop has been duly elected 'a populo civitatis,' and for his examination in respect of morality, discipline, etc., both in private and in public, and for his due presentation. All this precedes the ordination by the interval of a day. Commonly a public examination of him who was to be ordained, in respect of doctrine and morality, took place at the time of the ordination (see Morinus pars ii. p. 275).[2]

[1] For the Spanish rite reference can now be made to the *Liber Ordinum* as edited for the first time by Dom Marius Férotin (Paris, 1904) coll. 54, 55. Its evidence is in complete harmony with that of the rites cited in the text.

[2] The examination in doctrine and morals is enjoined in the so-called *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*, a collection put together apparently in southern Gaul towards the end of the fifth century and published under the title *Synodus Africana* (or *Carthaginensis*) *ccxiiii episcoporum*: see Dom G. Morin *Revue Bénédictine*, 1913, pp. 334-342. In the editions of the *Concilia* it appears as the Fourth Council of Carthage: but it is (more correctly) described as 'secundum Gallorum institutiones' in the Ordo Romanus ap. Hittorp. p. 97 [ed. 1591, p. 70].

In the Missale Francorum (Morinus p. 245), which gives one of the earliest rites, we find first an *Exhortatio ad populum* to choose a worthy successor to the pastoral office: the election is to be 'testimonio presbyterorum et totius cleri et consilio civium ac consistentium,' and the elected is to be 'natalibus nobilis, moribus clarus, religione probus, fide stabilis, ... tenax in cunctis quae sacerdoti elegenda sunt.' Then follow prayers for God's assistance and for the effusion on those to be ordained of sacerdotal grace. After this the people are exhorted to pray God, who has established a propitiation for Himself and sacrifices and sacred rites (qui placationem suam et sacrificia et sacra constituit), to fill the high-priest with the due plenitude of honour and grade, with spiritual gifts, and wealth of sancti-

This is followed by a declaration of election, and by the ordination.[1]

The most original and constant accompanying prayer seems to be (*a*) a collect, as in the ordination of a presbyter, for the infusion of 'sacerdotal grace, the virtue of the divine benediction,' followed by (*b*) the *Consecratio*. In this God is invoked as having instituted all the symbolism of the old priesthood; because all that was there symbolized by outward decoration is to be realized in our priesthood by spiritual endowment; it is no longer the 'honor vestium,' but the 'splendor animarum.' Therefore He is implored to grant 'ut quicquid illa velamina in fulgore auri, in nitore gemmarum et multimodi operis varietate signabant, hoc in horum moribus clarescat.' Then there is a prayer that 'the unction of the Spirit (accompanying, as other MSS. specify, the symbolic external unction) may flow down abundantly upon those who are being ordained, "ut tui Spiritus virtus et interiorum ora repleat et exteriora circumtegat"; that they may be endowed with faith, love, peacefulness; [that they may be true evangelists, that they may have the ministry of reconciliation, in word and in the power of signs and wonders (signorum et prodigiorum); that their preaching may have power; that God will give them the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and they may use them rightly, "to edification and not to destruction"; that what they bind on earth may be bound in heaven, etc.; that whose sins they retain may be retained, and whose sins they remit may be remitted; that whom they bless may be blessed, and whom they curse may be cursed; that they may feed and perfect their flock; that they may have all zeal and right judgment;] that God may give them the episcopal see (cathedra) for ruling His Church, be to

fication, and especially with humility, that as a ruler he may make himself low and be among his flock as one of themselves (quasi unus ex illis), trembling always for the account for souls which he must give; also that he may be made fit for all sacred rites by the supreme benediction, the utmost that man can give (universis sacris sacrandisque idoneus fiat sub hac quae est homini per hominem postrema benedictio).

[1] The *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua* may have introduced into the West the eastern custom, at the ordination of a bishop, of holding the book of the Gospels over his head. (See references in Bingham *Antiq.* ii. 11, 8 to *Apost. Const.*, pseudo-Chrysostom, pseudo-Dionysius: the passage from pseudo-Chrysostom is quoted p. 97 *supra*, that from *Apost. Const.* is discussed in App. Note G, pp. 344, 346). In the *Statuta* it assumes this form (c. 2): 'Episcopus cum ordinatur, duo episcopi ponant et teneant evangeliorum codicem super caput et cervicem eius et, uno super eum fundente benedictionem, reliqui omnes episcopi, qui adsunt, manibus suis caput eius tangant.' So it passed into western writers and missals; it occurs in the Missale Francorum (Morinus *l.c.* p. 261), and in the Ordo Romanus according to Hittorp. (p. 100 [ed. 1591, p. 72]). But it is omitted in one form given in the Ordo (*ib.* p. 96 [69]); and we find (pseudo) Albinus Flaccus, *de Div. Off.* ap. Hittorp. p. 74 [62], protesting thus: 'illud vero (here follows the canon) non reperitur in auctoritate veteri neque nova, sed neque in Romana traditione.' So similarly Amalarius *de Eccl. Off.* i. 14 ap. Hittorp. p. 167 [142]: 'Dicit libellus, secundum cuius ordinem celebratur ordinatio apud quosdam, ut duo teneant evangelium super caput eius, quod neque vetus auctoritas intimat neque apostolica traditio neque canonica auctoritas.'

them authority and power and strength, and multiply His blessing upon them.' The part of the prayer enclosed in brackets [ ] is in the Gelasian Sacramentary (Murat. *op. cit.* i. col. 625) and in the Missale Francorum (Morinus *l.c.* p. 266), but not in the Leonine (Murat. i. 422) or Gregorian Sacramentary (*ib.* ii. 358). Omitting this part of the prayer, we have in the whole rite no *specification* of the special function of sacrifice or of the power of the keys.

Later on there are a number of additions to the rite, connected with the giving of the ring, pastoral staff, etc. The enthronization of the bishop would probably have formed part of the rite from the beginning; see Martene's Ord. i. and ii. (*op. cit.*, ed. 1700, ii. pp. 340, 342; ed. 1736, ii. pp. 88, 90).

D.

I. CANON XIII OF ANCYRA.

[C. H. Turner.]

II. CHOREPISCOPI.

(*See pp.* 141-142.)

This canon was quoted by Dr. Lightfoot (*Dissertation* p. 232) in the following form: χωρεπισκόποις μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴν μηδὲ πρεσβυτέροις πόλεως χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπιτραπῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μετὰ γραμμάτων ἐν ἑκάστῃ παροικίᾳ. 'That it be not allowed to country bishops to ordain presbyters or deacons, nor even to city presbyters, except permission be given in each parish by the bishop in writing.' Lightfoot refers to Routh's *Reliquiae Sacrae* (iv. 121, 144) as his authority, but he does not accept Routh's reading: for Routh gave πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως on the ground of what seemed to him overwhelming manuscript authority.

In fact the text of the early Greek councils is in an unsatisfactory state, and when Lightfoot wrote still less was known about it than is known to-day. Since the date of the *Dissertation* three important contributions to our better knowledge of the Ancyran canons have seen the light. In *Studia Biblica* iii. (1891), pp. 139-216, the late Mr. R. B. Rackham broke what was almost fresh ground with a detailed examination and classification of the Greek MSS. in some of the principal libraries of Western Europe. Considering that it was the work of a scholar under thirty years of age, this essay is in my opinion a very remarkable piece of work, and all subsequent investigators must stand under a deep load of obligation to it. Mr. Rackham read πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως with Routh, but against Routh, though doubtfully, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ. He agreed with Lightfoot against Routh that ἀλλὰ μὴν μηδέ must mean—not 'much less' but—'nor even.' Unfortunately the evidence of the oldest extant MSS. of the Greek canons, the two sister MSS. Patmos 172 and 173, was not accessible to him; and

these MSS. give a form of text which goes back behind the families into which the Greek MSS. now in Western Europe divide themselves. Nevertheless though they support the reading ἑκάστῃ of Routh against Rackham, and give as the opening word of the canon χωρεπισκόπους against both Routh and Rackham,[1] they agree with the πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως of these two scholars against Lightfoot's πρεσβυτέροις πόλεως.

But the real support of Lightfoot's reading of the canon lay in the Latin versions. Both the Latin and the Syriac versions of the early Greek councils are of primary importance for the constitution of the text. From the acts of the council of Chalcedon in 451 we learn that the earlier councils had already been incorporated into a continuous series, consisting of at least the Nicene, Ancyran, Neocaesarean, Gangran and Antiochene canons: but of the direct tradition of the Greek text between the middle of the fifth century and the date of the Patmos MSS., c. 800 A.D., our knowledge is almost nil.[2] So much the more important does it become that we have Syriac and Latin translations made in the fifth and sixth centuries; and these have in recent years been critically edited. Something was already known of both, and Mr. Rackham's essay added something more for the Syriac: but the Syriac evidence was only made public in its entirety by the edition of Friedrich Schulthess, *Die syrischen Kanonen der Synoden von Nicaea bis Chalcedon* (Berlin, 1908), and, though much more had been done for the Latin, the material was for the first time brought together in *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima*, ii. 1 (Oxford, 1907).

Of the Latin versions the 'Gallica' belongs probably to the second half of the fourth century, the Isidorian 'antiqua' to the early part of the fifth, the 'Prisca' and the Dionysian (a revision of the Isidorian) to the early part of the sixth. But the Gallica has come down to us imperfect, and we have no rendering of this particular canon. The Prisca is no more helpful than if it too had not survived: for the older of its two MSS. abbreviates every occurrence of *chorepiscopus*, *presbyter*, *diaconus*, in the canon (chorepiscopp. presb. diac.), so that we have no means of telling what case is intended, while the later and better MS. writes for the crucial words 'presbiterum civitatis.' The Isidorian has 'presbyteris civitatis'; there are variants 'presbyterum' and 'presbyteros,' but as the text goes on to water down the functions alluded to in the second part of the canon,[3] it may be concluded with certainty that the translator thus tried to avoid any appearance of sanctioning presbyterian ordination, and that the dative plural is correct. The earlier of Dionysius' two versions repeats in substance the

[1] The reading χωρεπισκόπους was conjecturally suggested in the first edition of the present work.

[2] The indirect tradition, that is, the history of the systematic collections which break up the continuous series of canons and group them under subject-matter headings, is being worked out by a Russian scholar, Prof. Beneschewitsch; and it is likely that the results of his researches will be of great importance.

[3] 'Sed nec presbyteris civitatis sine episcopi praecepto amplius aliquid iubere.'

minimizing paraphrase of the Isidorian: but in his second version he gives the equivalent of Lightfoot's text, and it was this later version which, as sent by Pope Hadrian to Charles the Great, was the principal source of primitive Canon Law in the West during the ninth and succeeding centuries.

Thus the Greek evidence in the main supports πρεσβυτέρους, the Latin πρεσβυτέροις. All the Latin versions render ἑκάστῃ, not ἑτέρᾳ. Postponing for the moment the Syriac evidence, we return to the point at issue between Lightfoot and Routh over the meaning of ἀλλὰ μὴν μηδέ (οὐδέ). There can be, I think, no real doubt that the use of this idiom is to exclude a case which might have seemed a stronger or more possible one than that just dealt with, the English equivalent being 'nay, not even.' Two illustrations of the use, from the fourth and fifth century respectively, may be cited: Socrates, *H. E.* iii. 1 *ad fin.*, of the emperor Julian: τὸ μὲν γὰρ μαγείρους καὶ κουρεῖς ἐκβαλεῖν φιλοσόφου ἔργον, οὐ μὴν βασιλέως· τὸ δὲ διασύρειν ἢ σκώπτειν οὐκέτι φιλοσόφου, ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ βασιλέως: and Basil *adv. Eunomium* iii. 6, ἀγένητον δὲ οὐδεὶς οὕτως ἔξω παντελῶς ἐστι τοῦ φρονεῖν ὥστε τολμῆσαι ἕτερον πλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ὅλων προσαγορεῦσαι, ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ υἱὸν τῷ ἕνα εἶναι τὸν μονογενῆ, 'we cannot call the Holy Spirit "Unbegotten" for that is the unique characteristic of God Almighty, nor yet can we even call him "Son," since the Son too is unique, for he is "Only-begotten," and therefore there cannot be two Sons.'

To apply this to the canon before us. 'Chorepiscopi may not ordain priests and deacons, no, nor even may town priests do so': in other words, the case for town priests ordaining priests and deacons was stronger than the case for chorepiscopi doing so. But this is, to speak frankly, nonsense. Even if it were granted that ordination by presbyters was conceivable in Asia Minor in the fourth century, it is not conceivable that they could have had a better claim to the power of ordination than suffragan bishops.

The text as we have it must be wrong. Without knowing the true reading of the Syriac version or versions, I had some time ago come to the definite conclusion that the word πρεσβυτέρους or πρεσβυτέροις in the second half of the canon was an intrusive element. It was tempting to read with some of Mr. Rackham's less important MSS. ἐπισκόποις, but the argument was unanswerable that if that had been the original reading in the canon no one would have dreamed of altering it. It remained then, in view especially of the crude Greek style of these Ancyran canons, to suppose that neither ἐπισκόποις nor πρεσβυτέροις nor πρεσβυτέρους stood in the text as the council issued it, but that they wrote ἀλλὰ μὴν μηδὲ πόλεως simply, πόλεως being intended to balance χώρα in χωρεπισκόποις: '*country*-bishops may not ordain priests and deacons, nay, not even *city*-bishops may do it, without the written authorization in every case of the diocesan bishop.'

This conjecture is, if I understand Schulthess' Syriac text correctly, borne out by the Syriac evidence: 'To chorepiscopi it is not allowed

that they should make priests or deacons in the country, but also not in the city, without permission of the bishop, which permission is to be in each place in writing.' The translator did not in my view understand πόλεως rightly, for his rendering fails to give the proper force to ἀλλὰ μὴν μηδέ: but it seems clear that πόλεως in the Greek text before him was unaccompanied by any defining words, whether 'priest' or 'bishop.' If so, there is external evidence for a reading which I should have ventured to commend to acceptance on internal evidence alone.

The canon then will run: χωρεπισκόποις μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν· ἀλλὰ μὴν μηδὲ πόλεως, χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπιτραπῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μετὰ γραμμάτων ἐν ἑκάστῃ παροικίᾳ.

II. CHOREPISCOPI were country bishops ordained to supervise the scattered flock in rural districts—'vicarii episcoporum,' as Isidore of Seville calls them. We begin to hear of them in the East as established institutions early in the fourth century: later on they had a great development in the West also. The first mention is in the canon of Ancyra just discussed, A.D. 314: allusion is also made to them in the thirteenth (or fourteenth) canon of Neocaesarea, *c.* A.D. 315, and in the tenth canon of Antioch, A.D. 341. The Antiochene canon directs (*a*) that they might be ordained by the *one* bishop alone, who presided over the church of that city to the territory of which their country district belonged; (*b*) that they might ordain to the minor orders, but not to the diaconate or presbyterate without the leave of the bishop under whom they served. Thus it limits their power, while at the same time it recognises their episcopal character, εἰ καὶ χειροθεσίαν εἶεν ἐπισκόπων εἰληφότες: Dionysius Exiguus is clearly right in rendering this 'ut episcopi consecrati sunt,' though he at the same time retains an incorrect rendering from the older, so-called Isidorian, version, 'manus inpositionem ab episcopis susceperunt.' At Nicaea the names of some fourteen chorepiscopi from different districts of Asia Minor and Syria (the largest contingents come from Cappadocia and Isauria) are found among the two hundred and twenty signatures. At later councils the numbers of chorepiscopi are fewer, and perhaps they only vote and sign with the assent of their superior bishops; see Bingham *Ant.* ii. 14 § 10; Morinus *de Sacr. Ord.* pars. iii. ex. iv. 1. § 12. Athanasius classes them with bishops in *Apol. c. Ar.* 85: 'Mareotis is a district (χώρα) of Alexandria, and there has never been in the district a *bishop or even chorepiscopus*' but only presbyters subject to the bishop of Alexandria. Isidore, *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 6, describes them thus, using the language of the 'Isidorian' version of the Neocaesarean and Antiochene canons: 'Chorepiscopi, id est vicarii episcoporum, iuxta quod canones ipsi testantur, instituti sunt ad exemplum lxx seniorum tamquam sacerdotes propter sollicitudinem pauperum.[1] Hi in vicis et villis instituti

[1] Rabanus Maurus (*de Inst. Cler.* i. 5 ap. Hittorp. p. 315 [ed. 1591, p. 267]) adds: 'ne eis [*sc.* pauperibus qui in agris et villis consistunt] solatium confirmationis deesset.'

gubernant sibi conmissas ecclesias, habentes licentiam constituere lectores, subdiaconos, exorcistas. Presbyteros autem et diaconos ordinare non audeant praeter conscientiam episcopi in cuius regione praeesse noscuntur. Hi autem a solo episcopo civitatis cui adiacent ordinantur.'

Later, in the awful collapse of discipline which characterized the Frankish kingdom, they were indefinitely multiplied: 'wandering bishops ordained wandering clergy, and neither bishops nor clergy were easily brought to acknowledge a superior.'[1] Isidore speaks bitterly of this state of things (*de Eccl. Off.* ii. 3): 'Duo sunt genera clericorum: unum ecclesiasticorum sub regimine episcopali degentium: alterum acephalorum . . . quem sequantur ignorantium. Hos . . . solutos atque oberrantes sola turpis vita complectitur et vaga . . . quorum quidem sordida atque infami numerositate satis superque nostra pars occidua polluitur.'[2] Hence at the restoration of discipline, which marks the age of Charles the Great,[3] the chorepiscopi were the subjects of strong animadversion. Their usurpation of authority led to a disparagement of their original position. Papal decisions—not, however, that of Pope Nicholas, A.D. 864—pronounced them *mere presbyters*. Hence later Roman Catholic writers, e.g. Morinus and others,[4] have argued in this sense. The papal authority constitutes their real argument—'efficacissimum argumentum,' as says Morinus. However, he also argues—(i) That they are compared to the seventy elders, which is the comparison appropriated to *presbyters*.[5] Yes: to presbyters as *assistants*. This is the point of the comparison, and it holds for chorepiscopi also. Further, it is well known that the Old Testament analogies are loosely applied. (ii) That ordinations of *bishops* by one bishop were not tolerated, while chorepiscopi were so ordained. Yes: this, however, was a matter of provincial discipline—to secure the assent of the provincial bishops. But the chorepiscopi were an inferior sort of bishops with only a local, not a provincial or catholic, position. Morinus, however, does not hold them to have been presbyters pure and simple but a sort of middle order: 'non sunt presbyteri simplices, sed inter episcopatum et presbyteratum media dignitas' (*l.c.* c. 5 § 6).

The view given above of the position of the chorepiscopi may be described as the ordinary view. It seems to be the only one supported by the evidence. Dr. Lightfoot, in his *Dissertation* p. 232 note 3, represents them as a survival of the original presbyter-bishops, but this theory has no evidence for it except such as is derived from the misread canon of Ancyra. The eastern chorepiscopi of later days were

[1] Hatch *Growth of Church Institutions* p. 159.

[2] Morinus (*l.c.* c. 5 § 4) finds in the circumstances of his own day a parallel to the ancient appointment of chorepiscopi in a way which led to their abuse: 'ut nunc, in Germania potissimum, ditissimi et principes illi episcopi titularibus episcopis [utuntur] . . . qui pauca mercede contenti dioecesis onera ferunt, quamdiu veri episcopi Endymionis somnum dormiunt.'

[3] Hatch *op. cit.* p. 28 f.

[4] See Bingham *Ant.* ii. 14, §§ 2, 3, 4.

[5] See Morinus *l.c.* c. 2, §§ 6-11.

confessedly only presbyters. Further information (with reference to their privileges, uses, etc., and their suppression) can be found in Bingham *l.c.*; Morinus *l.c.*; and *Dict. Chr. Antiquities*, s.v.

E.

SUPPOSED ORDINATIONS BY PRESBYTERS IN EAST AND WEST.

(*See pp.* 149, 151.)

Eastern Church.

The only case of such an ordination alleged in the East is that of Paphnutius. Dr. Hatch (*B. L.* p. 108 n.[52], 1st edition only) spoke of this formerly as 'the clearest case . . . maintainable on the evidence.' But it will not at all bear examination. Cassian, writing his Memoirs of Oriental hermits at Marseilles about A.D. 422, tells us that the presbyter-abbot Paphnutius 'promoted' one of his companions on account of his conspicuous virtue, first to the diaconate, and then to the presbyterate (*Collat.* iv. 1: 'a Paphnutio presbytero . . . [Daniel] ad diaconii est praelectus officium . . . eum presbyterii honore provexit [Paphnutius]'). This is taken to mean that he ordained him, and Cassian is supposed to mention it without surprise.

But (1) it is most improbable that Cassian, writing when and where he did, should mention such an act as if it were nothing surprising. He himself was in intimate relations with bishops in the West and knew well the difference between a monk and an ecclesiastical officer. See xi. 2 and his dedication to books i. and xi.

(2) We have other evidence of the sense in which an abbot could promote to church offices. He could do it in the same sense as persons in power of any sort in the Church, as, for instance, a Prime Minister or patron of our day. He could *get him ordained at his nomination.* So we have a provision in the rule of St. Benedict (cap. 62) for abbots selecting worthy monks and getting them ordained. It may be noticed that this power of 'nominating' or 'suggesting names,' *ὑποβάλλειν ὀνόματα*, must have been in regular use in Egypt, as it is definitely withdrawn from ex-Meletian bishops by the council of Nicaea: see the synodal letter to the church of Alexandria in Socr. *H. E.* i. 9.

(3) We are then bound to interpret the words in the present passage in the sense of 'nomination,' if they will admit of it. And they will do so without any difficulty. Instances are frequent in which influential laymen are said even to 'ordain' church officers, where there can be no doubt that what is meant is to appoint or get ordained; the laity of Oxyrhynchus in Arian days 'episcopum sibi per tunc temporis episcopos catholicos ordinavit' (*Marcell. et Faust. Lib. Prec.* ap. 'Collectio Avellana' ep. ii. § 94 in *Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.* vol. xxxv. or Migne

Patrol. Lat. xiii. p. 101); again, without any explanation, Gregory of Tours *Hist. Franc.* viii. 22: 'Rex pollicitus fuerat se numquam ex laicis episcopum ordinaturum.' Otto III says 'Silvestrum papam elegimus et . . . ordinavimus et creavimus' (*Mon. Germ. Hist.: Constitutiones et Acta Publica Imperatorum* i. ed. Weiland, p. 56). St. Cyprian (see just below) uses constituo and facio in the sense of procuring the appointment; cf. Bright *Early Eng. Ch. History* p. 134 [ed. 2, p. 141], from whom most of these instances are taken.

(5) It must be borne in mind that supposing Paphnutius had attempted to ordain any one in the ecclesiastical sense, he would have done what, in the patriarchate of Alexandria, had been long before (in Colluthus' case) pronounced null and void, and Daniel by the decision of the synod would have been regarded as a layman. But, as we have said, there is no case at all to be made out for his having done so.

Western Church.

1. The presbyter Novatus is said to have ordained Felicissimus deacon, and it is contended (Hatch *B. L.*[2] p. 110 n.[52]) that St. Cyprian did not regard the act as *invalid*. What is the state of the case? 'He appointed Felicissimus deacon (Felicissimum diaconum constituit),' St. Cyprian says (*Ep.* lii. 2), and there is, it is urged, 'nothing in the context to support the view that he uses the word in the unusual sense of "procured the appointment."' Is there nothing? St. Cyprian goes on to say that the same Novatus, when he left Africa and got to Rome, made Novatian a bishop. He uses the same word in both cases: 'qui istic adversus ecclesiam diaconum fecerat illic episcopum fecit.' He made Felicissimus a deacon, we may presume, in exactly the same sense as that in which he made Novatian a bishop. And in what sense did he do that? We know from the contemporary letter of Cornelius, the outraged bishop of Rome (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43 §§ 8, 9): 'he [Novatian] compelled three bishops, boorish and most foolish men, . . . to give him the episcopate by a shadowy and vain imposition of hands.' Cf. Cyprian *Ep.* xlix. 1: 'ei manum quasi in episcopatum imponi.' Novatus then made Novatian a bishop and Felicissimus a deacon in this sense, that he *got them made* such by people, who, however 'boorish' or 'foolish,' were none the less bishops (unless indeed Felicissimus was a deacon before, which is possible or probable; see *Dict. Chr. Biog.* s.v., and Brightman in *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*, 1918, p. 402 n.[1]).

2. Dr. Hatch alleges in the same note that presbyter-missionaries in the Middle Ages ordained under exceptional circumstances of necessity, e.g. St. Willehad and St. Liudger, of the eighth century, are both in their *Lives* said to have 'constituted churches and ordained presbyters over them'; see Pertz *Monumenta Hist. German.* ii. pp. 381, 411: 'ecclesias [Willehadus] coepit construere ac presbyteros super eas ordinare.' In both cases, however, a little investigation makes it

plain that ordinare is used in the sense of 'appointing,' as it is used of secular persons (see just above). In the case of Willehad, his biographer tells us he remained a presbyter too long, because it was feared that the lawlessness of the Frisians would not tolerate the authority of a bishop. He therefore continued 'cuncta potestate praesidentis ordinans—secundum quod poterat,' i.e. up to a presbyter's power. Afterwards Charles the Great had him made bishop, 'consecrari fecit.' Then he redoubled his efforts and went about 'confirmans populum qui olim baptizatus fuerat.' He could not therefore *confirm* till he was made bishop. Is it likely then that he could *ordain*? In ruling churches and appointing presbyters, however, he had only been doing what many 'ruling presbyters' in the mission field had done since, and are doing. In the case of Liudger, we are told that he was kept from being consecrated bishop by a sense of *unworthiness* and tried to get some one else consecrated in his place. Here then was not even a case of necessity, if such could be admitted, for a presbyter ordaining. The word is clearly used in his case, as in Willehad's, for 'appointing,' and both cases fall together. Both missionaries come in a close relation to the see of Rome and its strict discipline.

3. Dr. Hatch says further in the same note: 'Ordination by other than a bishop, with the permission of the pope, is allowed even by the schoolmen and canonists, although the question is discussed among them whether the pope's licence can extend to the conferring of all orders, or should be limited to orders below the presbyterate.' Now there need be no question here of minor orders or even of the diaconate. What the matter comes to is this: a few mediæval canonists (see opinions quoted in Morinus *de Sacr. Ord.* pars iii. ex. iv. cap. iii.) maintained the theory that the papal licence could enable a presbyter validly to confer his own order (and even a confirmed Christian his own confirmation). But (*a*) this was a mere abstract question; there is no instance of a pope having attempted to give such a licence. And (*b*) Dr. Hatch's 'even' is singularly out of place; this was an instance of papalism overriding catholicism. The men who made these claims on behalf of the pope were least of all maintainers of ancient discipline or liberty; they would have made almost any claim on his behalf. Yet even so, the greatest authorities would not allow, even as a matter of theory, that the pope's commission enabled a presbyter to ordain to the presbyterate. St. Thomas Aquinas says, *in Lib. iv. Sent.* dist. 25. qu. 1. art. 1: 'Papa, qui habet plenitudinem potestatis pontificalis, potest committere non episcopo ea quae ad episcopalem dignitatem pertinent, dummodo illa non habeant immediatam relationem ad verum corpus Christi. Et ideo ex eius commissione aliquis sacerdos simpliciter potest conferre minores ordines et confirmare, non autem aliquis non sacerdos; nec iterum sacerdos maiores ordines, qui habent immediatam relationem ad corpus Christi, supra quod consecrandum papa non habet maiorem potestatem quam simplex sacerdos.'

F.

THE THEORY OF THE MINISTRY HELD BY AMBROSIASTER, JEROME, ETC.

(*See pp.* 156-161.)

THE position adopted in the text is to be here justified by quotations.

I. AMBROSIASTER.[1] (*a*) *His theory of ordination and the priesthood. in* 1 *Tim.* iv. 14: 'Gratiam dari ordinatoris significat [Paulus] per prophetiam et manuum impositionem. . . . manus vero impositiones verba sunt mystica quibus confirmatur ad hoc opus electus, accipiens auctoritatem, teste conscientia sua, ut audeat vice Domini sacrificium Deo offerre.' Cf. the reason why Christian 'levitae aut sacerdotes' should abstain from the indulgences of marriage (*in* 1 *Tim.* iii. 13); 'Dei antistes' (*in* 1 *Tim.* v. 19); 'in huius persona totius populi salus consistit' (*in* 1 *Tim.* vi. 16); 'vicarius Christi' (*in* 2 *Tim.* i. 9); 'actores Dei' (*in* 1 *Tim.* iii. 13). He holds, however, that the original arrangements in regard to the ministry were freer than those which prevailed subsequently. 'When churches had been established in all places and officers appointed, arrangements were made different from those with which things had begun. At first all used to teach and all to baptize, on whatever days and at whatever time there was occasion. . . . In order that the people might increase and be multiplied, all at the beginning were allowed both to preach the Gospel and to baptize and to explain the Scriptures in church; but when the Church spread to all parts, places of meeting [conventicula] were established and rulers [rectores] and other offices in the churches appointed, that none of the clergy who had not been ordained to it should venture to take to himself an office which he knew not to have been committed or allowed to him.'[2] There is thus a difference between modern and ancient arrangements. But even this very primitive practice of the earliest beginnings of the Church did not mean an indiscriminate condition of things. Even in the earliest days, we are told in the same passage, there were apostles, prophets, evangelists (who 'are deacons and not priests') and so on. Nor does he include among the things permitted to all, even for a time, the sacerdotal functions of sacrifice or laying-on of hands.[3]

(*b*) *His recognition of the divine authority of the episcopate and of the principle of succession.* 'In episcopo omnes ordines sunt, quia primus sacerdos est, hoc est, princeps est sacerdotum et propheta et evangelista et cetera adimplenda officia ecclesiae in ministerio fide-

[1] The Commentaries of Ambrosiaster on the Pauline Epistles are printed among the *spuria* at the end of St. Ambrose's works: ed. Bened. ii. 25.

[2] *in Eph.* iv. 11, 12.

[3] He uses the general Christian priesthood only as a ground for the position that all Christian people *can become priests* (i.e. in the ministry): 'In lege nascebantur sacerdotes ex genere Aaron Levitae; nunc autem omnes ex genere sunt sacerdotali . . . ideoque ex populo potest fieri sacerdos' (*l.c.*)

lium' (*in Eph.* iv. 11); 'in episcopo omnium ordinationum dignitas est' (*in* 1 *Cor.* i. 17); 'et quia ab uno Deo Patre sunt omnia, singulos episcopos singulis ecclesiis praeesse decrevit' (*in* 1 *Cor.* xii. 28); 'Paulus et Timotheus utique episcopi erant' (*in Phil.* i. 1); Archippus was a bishop (*in Col.* iv. 17); the Apostles were bishops (*in Eph.* iv. 11, *in* 1 *Cor.* xii. 28). St. Paul is so exact in his directions in the Pastoral Epistles not from anxiety for Timothy, but on account of his successors, that they might observe the ordinance of the Church, and that they too, who in their turn hand on the form to their successors, might begin from themselves, i.e. in spiritual discipline (*in* 1 *Tim.* vi. 16). Whatever changes were made were made under the authority of an (apostolic) council: 'immutata est ratio prospiciente concilio'[1] (*in Eph.* iv. 11).

(*c*) *His theory of the original identity of bishops and presbyters.* 'Timotheum presbyterum a se creatum episcopum vocat [sc. Paulus], quia primi presbyteri [i.e. the first presbyters] episcopi appellabantur, ut recedente eo sequens ei succederet. Denique apud Aegyptum presbyteri consignant, si praesens non sit episcopus. Sed quia coeperunt sequentes presbyteri indigni inveniri ad primatus tenendos, immutata est ratio prospiciente concilio; ut non ordo sed meritum crearet episcopum, multorum sacerdotum iudicio constitutum, ne indignus temere usurparet et esset multis scandalum' (*in Eph.* iv. 11, 12). Here it is implied that at one period the difference of presbyter and bishop was not one of 'order' but only of selection. Again, when he has to account for St. Paul passing from the bishop to the deacon (*in* 1 *Tim.* iii. 10), he writes thus: 'Quare, nisi quia episcopi et presbyteri una ordinatio est? Uterque enim sacerdos est, sed episcopus primus est, ut omnis episcopus presbyter sit, non tamen omnis presbyter episcopus; hic enim episcopus est, qui inter presbyteros primus est. Denique Timotheum presbyterum ordinatum significat; sed quia ante se alterum non habebat, episcopus erat. Unde et quemadmodum episcopum ordinet, ostendit; neque enim fas erat aut licebat, ut inferior ordinaret maiorem; nemo enim tribuit, quod non accepit.' A little further, on ver. 13: 'Nunc autem septem diaconos esse oportet et aliquantos presbyteros, ut bini sint per ecclesias, et unus in civitate episcopus.'

Take this language as a whole, and I think we shall draw the conclusion that the commentator did indeed minimize the distinction of grade within the sacerdotium. But I do not think we have any reason to suppose that he would have regarded the presbyters of his own day as posesssing, under any circumstances, the power which the earliest presbyters possessed; because the *ordinations in his own day were distinct*, and the presbyter who attempted to lay on hands would do what is, in his words (*in Eph.* iv. 11), 'praesumere officium quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum.'

[1] Cf. Lightfoot *Dissertation* p. 203 n.[5].

The AUTHOR OF THE QUAESTIONES[1]—doubtless the same 'Ambrosiaster'—uses the same idea of the ministry (in *Qu.* ci. § 5) in order to castigate in the spirit of Jerome the Roman deacons. He says: 'Quid est enim episcopus nisi primus presbyter, hoc est summus sacerdos? Denique non aliter quam compresbyteros hos vocat et consacerdotes: numquid et ministros condiaconos suos dicit episcopus? Non utique, quia multo inferiores sunt . . . nam in Alexandria et per totam Aegyptum, si desit episcopus, consignat presbyter.' Consigno has, of course, nothing to do with any power of presbyters to ordain (see above p. 119): it is the regular word for confirmation, but is never used for ordination.

II. JEROME (*Ep.* cxlvi.) repeats the theory of Ambrosiaster, adding to it the remark discussed above (p. 118) about the Alexandrian election to the episcopate.

(*a*) *His sacerdotalism.* Jerome is a great sacerdotalist. He believes indeed in the priesthood of the laity (*adv. Lucifer.* 4: 'sacerdotium laici, id est baptisma'), but not in such sense as militates against sacerdotalism (*ib.* 21: 'ecclesia non est quae non habet sacerdotes'), even in an extreme form—'a priest can intercede for a layman or a monk, but, if a priest falls, who can intercede for him?' (*ib.* 5; the same idea already in *Ep.* xiv. *ad Heliodorum* § 9). Again and again he dwells on the sacerdotal authority and sacrificial function.

(*b*) *His recognition of the apostolic authority of the episcopate.* 'Ecclesia multis gradibus consistens ad extremum diaconis, presbyteris, episcopisque finitur' (*adv. Lucifer.* 22); 'quid facit excepta ordinatione episcopus quod presbyter non faciat? . . . omnes [episcopi] apostolorum successores sunt' (*Ep.* cxlvi. *ad Evangelum*). The present *monepiscopal* constitution is attributed to (apostolic) decree (*in Tit.* i. 5): 'in toto orbe decretum est.' The apostles are represented as ordaining bishops and priests: 'quod fecerunt et apostoli, per singulas provincias presbyteros et episcopos ordinantes' (*in Matt.* xxv. 26).

(*c*) *His theory of the original identity of bishops and presbyters.* This he (*Ep.* cxlvi. *ad Evangelum*) proves from the language of Scripture, and continues: 'quod autem postea unus electus est qui ceteris praeponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est; ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi ecclesiam rumperet.' Then follows the passage about Alexandria, and the conclusion just quoted, 'quid facit, excepta ordinatione, etc.?' So to the same effect *in Tit.* i. 5: 'Idem est presbyter qui et episcopus.' At first 'communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiae gubernabantur;' then factions arose, 'I am of Paul,' etc. On this account 'in toto orbe decretum est ut unus de presbyteris electus superponeretur ceteris.' He would therefore have the bishops in his own day

[1] The text of the *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* has now been critically edited by Prof. A. Souter in the Vienna *Corpus Script. Eccl. Lat.*, vol. l., A.D. 1908.

recognise that 'se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis dominicae veritate presbyteris esse maiores.' Of course this is strong language. St. Jerome does not measure words when his temper is up, as it was with bishops. But even so I do not think it can be fairly taken to mean that Jerome ever held a *presbyter of his own day* to be the same as a bishop, even in an extreme case. The conclusion he draws in the text is only that bishops should govern the Church 'in commune,' i.e. with the co-operation of the presbyters, 'in imitation of Moses, who, when he had it in his power to rule the people alone, chose seventy elders to judge the people with him.' Still earlier he had said, in the *adv. Lucifer.* 9: 'Ecclesiae salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet: cui si non exsors quaedam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in ecclesiis efficientur schismata quot sacerdotes.' The distinctive powers of the bishop had their origin, according to Jerome, in moral necessities, but those necessities were paramount, and the result of the change involved in the limitation of the episcopate was one that could not be reversed.

IV. LATER LATIN WRITERS. Certainly it was in the sense of an original, not of a present, identity of the episcopate and the presbyterate, that St. Jerome's influence and authority impressed his view on late Latin authors.[1] It is desirable to illustrate this by quotations.

ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, c. A.D. 625, in his *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 7 (ap. Hittorp. p. 22 [ed. 1591, p. 19]: '[Presbyteris] sicut episcopis dispensatio mysteriorum Dei commissa est. Praesunt enim ecclesiis Christi, et in confectione divina corporis et sanguinis consortes cum episcopis sunt, similiter et in doctrina populorum et in officio praedicandi.' He follows Jerome in saying that only ordination is reserved to the bishop. Again he quotes St. Paul to show 'presbyterum etiam sub episcopi nomine taxari'; he says 'secundus et paene coniunctus gradus [sc. presbyterorum] est.' On the other hand he clearly distinguishes the orders and (citing Pope Innocent) adds confirmation to ordination (ii. 26): 'Presbyteri, licet sint sacerdotes, pontificatus tamen apicem non habent. Hoc autem solis pontificibus deberi, ut vel consignent vel paracletum Spiritum tradant, quod non solum ecclesiastica consuetudo demonstrat, verum et superior illa lectio apostolorum [i.e. Acts viii. 14 f.] . . . Nam presbyteris, sive extra episcopum sive praesente episcopo baptizant, chrismate baptizatos ungere licet, sed quod ab episcopo fuerit consecratum; non tamen frontem ex eodem oleo signare, quod solis debetur episcopis cum tradunt Spiritum paracletum.' Cf. also ii. 5, which is quite clear, and makes only bishops in the later sense the successors of the Apostles.

The material of these different prescriptions is summed up in canon 7 of the SECOND COUNCIL OF SEVILLE presided over by Isidore A.D.

[1] St. Augustin admitted, at any rate by implication, the change of nomenclature, *Ep.* lxxxii. *ad Hieron.* § 33: 'Quamquam secundum honorum vocabula quae iam ecclesiae usus obtinuit episcopatus presbyterio maior sit, tamen in multis rebus Augustinus Hieronymo minor est.'

619: 'Nam quamvis cum episcopis plurima [presbyteris] ministeriorum [v.l. mysteriorum] communis sit dispensatio, quaedam tamen auctoritate veteris legis, quaedam novellis ecclesiasticis regulis, sibi prohibita noverint; sicut presbyterorum et diaconorum ac virginum consecratio, sicut constitutio altaris, benedictio vel unctio; siquidem nec licere iis ecclesiam vel altarium consecrare; nec per impositionem manus fidelibus baptizatis vel conversis ex haeresibus paracletum Spiritum tradere; nec chrisma conficere, nec chrismate baptizatorum frontem signare; sed nec publice quidem in missa quemquam paenitentium reconciliare; nec formatas cuilibet epistolas mittere. Haec enim omnia illicita esse presbyteris, quia pontificatus apicem non habent, quod solis deberi episcopis auctoritate canonum praecipitur, ut per hoc et discretio graduum et dignitatis fastigium summi pontificis demonstretur. Sed neque coram episcopo licere presbyteris in baptisterium introire, neque praesente antistite infantem tingere aut signare, nec paenitentes sine praecepto episcopi sui reconciliare, nec eo praesente sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi conficere, nec eo coram posito populum docere vel benedicere aut salutare nec plebem utique exhortari.'

(Pseudo) ALBINUS FLACCUS, 9th century, in the *de Div. Off.* (ap. Hittorp. p. 72 [ed. 1591, p. 62]) distinguishes the powers of bishop and presbyter. He goes on to say that formerly the names were used indiscriminately, i.e. in the New Testament, 'sed postmodum utili satis provisione constitutum est, ut hoc nomen [i.e. episcopus] solis pontificibus tribuatur, quorum maioris gradus excellentia crescat et minor ordo mensurae suae limitem recognoscat, sitque differentia in vocabulis sicut praecelsior locus honoris.' This means, I think, that there had always been a difference of *grade* which produced a distinction of name. He afterwards (p. 74 [63]) quotes Jerome's account of the early Alexandrian mode of electing a bishop; and at an earlier point (p. 50 [43]), while repeating the older rule which allowed a deacon to receive confessions where there is no priest, he makes bishops *or* presbyters the proper ministers of the penitential discipline, because to them 'claves regni caelestis traditae sunt.'

AMALARIUS, bishop of Treves, early 9th century, in his *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 13 (ap. Hittorp. p. 165 [ed. 1591, p. 141]), holds about the same language, i.e. he recognises community of names in the New Testament, and quotes Jerome on the Epistle to Titus and on the Alexandrian election of bishops. But he also assumes an original distinction of office, and quoting 'Ambrose' [i.e. Theodore of Mopsuestia: see Swete's edition ii. 124], makes the successors of the Apostles take from the lower grade its name of 'bishop,' because they would not arrogate to themselves the title of apostles; so that those were called bishops 'qui et ordinationis praediti sunt potestate.'

RABANUS MAURUS, 9th century, follows Jerome and Isidore and recognises the original community of names in the New Testament—'sub episcoporum nomine presbyteros complexus est [Paulus]'—but keeps the distinction of offices clear (*de Inst. Cler.* i. 4. 6, ap. Hittorp.

pp. 313, 315 [ed. 1591, pp. 266, 267]). He makes three *ordines* in the Church, laity, monks and clergy; and eight *gradus*, the chief being bishop, priest, and deacon. In ii. 30 (p. 341 [289]), Rabanus, while making bishop or presbyter the minister of private confession, makes the bishop the minister of public penance, and the bishop, or presbyter at his direction (iussu tamen episcoporum), the minister of public absolution.

Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* § 30 [ed. 4, p. 116; Eng. trans. i. p. 88], quotes a remarkable expression of Jerome's position from BERNALDUS OF CONSTANCE, c. A.D. 1088. He affirms that presbyters actually had 'antiquitus' [i.e. presumably in the apostolic age] episcopal powers, and this as a matter of certainty—'habuisse non dubitantur.' He goes on: 'Postquam autem presbyteri ab episcopali excellentia cohibiti sunt, coepit eis non licere quod licuit, videlicet quod ecclesiastica auctoritas solis pontificibus exequendum delegavit.'[1]

Gieseler gives other mediaeval references; but the effect of his whole note is to produce an erroneous impression. It is not the case that the ancient Church in general made little distinction between bishops and presbyters; that this mode of thought survived more or less into the Middle Ages; and that it was finally suppressed by the theology of Trent, while the Protestants returned to the ancient doctrine. I have shown, I think, that this is the exact contrary of the truth. The fact is that mediaeval writers who minimized the distinction of bishops and presbyters did so either to exalt the dignity of the sacrificial priesthood which is common to both, or in simple deference to Jerome's authority, or with the intention of magnifying the papal prerogative (see App. Note E, p. 334).

No doubt, as the secular importance of the Church increased, the secular dignity of the bishops increased also: but as regards the spiritual functions of the ministry, what history discloses to us is, not the limitations to bishops of functions previously enjoyed by presbyters, but the gradual distribution to the presbyters—as parish priests and monastic clergy—of functions which in earlier times had belonged normally only to the bishops: see above pp. 136, 137, and Brightman in *Early History of the Church and the Ministry* pp. 385-387.

G.

THE LAYING-ON OF HANDS.

IT is plain that the conclusions arrived at on pp. 166 ff. depend mainly on the question whether we have evidence to justify the statement that the ministers of the Church were from the first solemnly ordained by laying-on of hands and that a special gift of the Holy Ghost was believed to accompany the ceremony.

[1] Cf. also Morinus *de S. Ord.*, pars. iii. ex. iii. 2. 8 f.

It will be convenient to treat separately the question of fact as to the universality of the rite of laying-on of hands in ordination, and the question of the significance attributed to the rite.

I.

First then of the question of fact.

1. The Laying-on of hands is mentioned time after time in the New Testament. In the Gospels—four times in the earliest of our Gospels, or five times if we reckon in the appended verses—it is generally associated with the healing of the sick or maimed. Our Lord is asked to lay His hands on the daughter of Jairus and on the man that was deaf and dumb (St. Mark v. 23, vii. 32); He lays hands on a few sick and heals them (vi. 5), and puts His hands on the eyes of the blind man at Bethsaida (viii. 25): in the appendix to the Gospel, He sends out the apostles into the world with the promise that believers shall lay hands on the sick and the sick shall recover (St. Mark xvi. 18). But the same action also accompanies the blessing of the children (x. 16). So too in the Acts the laying-on of hands is mentioned in connexion not only with the special gift of healing (Acts ix. 12, 17; xxviii. 8), but also with the regular consecration of every baptized Christian in what we call confirmation (viii. 17-19; xix. 6), and of every Christian set apart for the work of the ministry in what we call ordination (vi. 6, *προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας*: xiii. 3, *νηστεύσαντες καὶ προσευξάμενοι καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς*—this, however, to send Paul and Barnabas on a special mission rather than to appoint them to office). In the Pastoral Epistles the same use is implied for ordination in 1 Tim. iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6, and either for the reconciliation of penitents or, more probably, again for ordination in 1 Tim. v. 22.

And the evidence of early Christian history is of a piece with the evidence of the New Testament. It is hardly too much to say that (apart from Baptism and the Eucharist) the laying-on of hands was the outward sign which constituted the 'matter' of every sacramental rite of the primitive Church. Thus, for instance, in the *Apostolic Constitutions* *χειροθεσία* or *χειροθετέω* or *ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν* is used of Confirmation (*Ap. Const.* ii. 32. 3; iii. 16. 3; vi. 7. 3; vii. 44. 3), of reconciliation of penitents, i.e. Absolution (ii. 18. 7, 41. 2, 43. 1; viii. 28. 3), of Ordination (iii. 10. 2; viii. 46. 9), as well as of the benediction of catechumens (vii. 39. 4) and of the bishop's benediction of the congregation at the morning and evening services (viii. 37. 4, 39. 1). In every case, of course, an accompanying prayer is either presumed or expressly mentioned: 'manus impositio . . . quid est aliud nisi oratio super hominem' says St. Augustine (*de bapt.* iii. 16 [21]: cf. Tertullian *de bapt.* 8 'manus imponitur per benedictionem').

Considering, then, this wide and almost universal range in Christian usage of the rite of the laying-on of hands, there is a quite enormous antecedent improbability that, in so solemn a benediction as that

which seals the calling of a man to the office of the ministry, the outward action of the laying-on of hands, as used by the apostles, should ever have been omitted.

2. But in the second place we can reinforce this antecedent improbability by producing from the literature of the third and fourth centuries a number of actual references to the laying-on of hands in ordination, the earliest of which are earlier than any of the alleged instances of its absence which we shall then go on to examine.

In the Hippolytean *Church Order*, when a bishop is being consecrated, all the bishops present first lay hands on him during a period of silent prayer, and then one bishop alone lays on his hands and recites a consecratory prayer. Similarly for presbyter and deacon, the imposition of the bishop's hands is expressly directed: in the former case the other presbyters join in the action and lay their hands as well on the head of the presbyter to be ordained. Nor is this all: hands are not to be laid either on those appointed to the minor orders, reader and subdeacon, or on women admitted to the class of widows or on virgins. Nothing can be clearer than that ordination by laying-on of hands is regarded as characteristic of the three essential orders, bishop, priest, and deacon.

Origen implies that bishops in his day were consecrated by laying-on of hands (*in Num.* xxii. 4, see above p. 128 n.[2]); and he himself was made a presbyter, as Eusebius tells us, by the same method, ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα στειλάμενος τὴν διὰ Παλαιστίνης, πρεσβυτερίου [*v.l.* πρεσβείου] χειροθεσίαν ἐν Καισαρείᾳ πρὸς τῶν τῇδε ἐπισκόπων ἀναλαμβάνει (*H. E.* vi. 23. 4).

St. Cyprian in one of his letters (*Ep.* lxvii. 5), where he is anxious to show that Basilides, a Spanish bishop who had lapsed in the Decian persecution, had been regularly replaced by the new bishop Sabinus, emphasizes the two elements of the 'suffrage' of the laity and the 'judgement' of the neighbouring bishops as sufficient proof that Sabinus was canonically qualified to be ordained as Basilides' successor, 'ut episcopatus ei deferretur': the act of ordination he describes in the words 'et manus ei in locum Basilidis inponeretur.' And from Cornelius' letters to his colleagues Cyprian at Carthage and Fabius at Antioch we learn that there was no doubt that Novatian, however invalid or irregular his consecration, had actually received the laying-on of hands for the episcopate: Novatian compelled three rustic bishops εἰκονικῇ τινι καὶ ματαίᾳ χειροπιθεσίᾳ ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτῷ δοῦναι (ap. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 43. 9), and the Roman confessors admit that they were so far led away 'ut paterentur ei manum quasi in episcopatum inponi' (ap. Cypr. *Ep.* xlix. 1). The consecration was, according to the theology of those times, null, not because the rite had not been really performed, but because the person who professed to have been consecrated was disqualified as an intruder.

The author of the *de aleatoribus*, a tract found among the writings attributed to St. Cyprian, has been identified by Harnack (*Texte und*

Untersuchungen, v. 1 [1888]) with Victor, bishop of Rome at the end of the second century, but he belongs more probably to the third century and to Africa. As a bishop addressing bishops, he speaks of the laying-on of hands as the means by which they received the grace of their office (c. 3).

Lastly the Ebionite Clementines represent St. Peter as ordaining bishops, and by implication priests and deacons, by laying-on of hands (*Hom.* iii. 72; *Recogn.* iii. 66; *Ep. Clem. ad Iac.* ii. 19).

We need not go on to give at length the evidence from the fourth century. The witness of Serapion can be gathered from the ordination prayers, with their rubrics, set out in App. Note C, p. 320: that of Lucifer is cited on pp. 156 n.[2], 348: for St. Basil see p. 347, and for St. Gregory Nazianzen's account of Basil's deathbed ordination, p. 146 n.[2]. Chrysostom (*Hom. in Act.* xiv. § 3) thus explains the expression ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας in Acts vi. 6: 'This is the χειροτονία; the hand of the man is laid upon the other, but all the working is of God, and His hand it is which touches the head of him who is ordained, if he be ordained aright.' Jerome too, when commenting on Isaiah lviii. 10 [9], where the LXX has χειροτονίαν, and the other translators ἐκτείνοντα δάκτυλον 'extentum digitum,' writes: 'Plerique nostrorum χειροτονίαν id est ordinationem clericorum, quae non solum ad imprecationem vocis sed ad impositionem impletur manus . . . sic intellegunt ut assumant testimonium Pauli scribentis ad Timotheum "manus cito nemini imposueris neque communicaveris peccatis alienis"' (*Comm. in Isai.* lib. xvi). In none of these cases is there any indication of a desire to lay stress upon the rite as something which it was necessary to defend or enforce. The allusions to it are quite unstudied, as to something which is always in the background whether or not it happens to be mentioned.

3. We have so far found, first, a great antecedent probability of the usage of laying-on of hands in ordination, and, secondly, a number of more or less chance allusions to its actual employment. We have now to face the question of the proper interpretation to be put on passages where we might, it is said, have expected to have the rite mentioned when in fact it is not.

Ordination or appointment is, of course, constantly alluded to in general terms, without any specification of the method, by early writers just as amongst ourselves.[1] But Dr. Hatch adduces five instances in which some or all of the other elements of a true ordination are named or emphasized to the exclusion of the laying-on of hands: the rite therefore, he argues, 'was not universal; it is impossible that, if it was not universal, it can have been regarded as essential' (*B. L.*[2] p. 134). These instances we proceed to examine.

[1] Thus, e.g., Theodoret, who had, as we shall see (p. 346), very clear ideas as to the method and effect of ordination, speaks simply of a bishop bringing a man to the altar and 'enrolling him in the priesthood' without his knowing it; elsewhere, in a similar case, he describes *how* it was done (*Relig. Hist.* xiii, xix).

a. 'Nor is the rite mentioned in the enumeration which Cyprian gives of the elements which had combined to make the election of Cornelius valid: it was of importance to show that no essential particular had been omitted, but he enumerates only the votes of the people, the testimony of the clergy, the consent of the bishops' (p. 133). This is not the case. It is quite true that Cyprian is emphasizing the due *election* of Cornelius by the community to prove that his consecration was not 'done in a corner.' But while he says: 'factus est Cornelius *de* Dei et Christi eius iudicio, *de* clericorum paene omnium testimonio, etc.' he also says just before: 'factus est episcopus *a* plurimis collegis nostris qui tunc in urbe Roma aderant.'[1] Cornelius was made a bishop *by* other bishops *on the basis of* a due election. How then was he made? By laying-on of hands, no doubt. We have seen above that both Cyprian and Cornelius in their extant letters imply the usage of laying-on of hands in making a bishop. And if it is asked why the rite is not mentioned here, the answer is simply that that was just the part of the matter which was not in dispute. Nobody questioned the fact that Cornelius had been consecrated to the episcopal office: the point at issue was his right to call himself bishop of Rome, and that depended on the evidence of his election by the people, of his approbation by the clergy, and of his confirmation by the neighbouring bishops.

b. 'In entire harmony with this [omission of the laying-on of hands] is the account which Jerome gives of the admission to office of the bishop of Alexandria: after the election the presbyters conduct the elected bishop to his chair: he is thereupon bishop *de facto*.' Quite so. This is Jerome's account of it. And because this is all that he thinks occurred, he and those who follow him would not describe it as a distinct ordination. There was, they say, originally only one ordination to the priesthood, *i.e.*, that which made a man a presbyter, after which he became a bishop by mere nomination. See p. 118 *supra*.

c. 'In a similar way Synesius, *Ep.* 67, p. 210, by his use of the phrase ἀποδεῖξαί τε καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου καθίσαι, appears to consider the announcement of election, followed by enthronization, as the constitutive elements of the ordination of a bishop' (p. 134 n.[45]). But ἀποδεῖξαι often means '*to constitute*,' '*to create*'; and the cognate verb ἀναδείξαι is used in the previous letter in the sense '*to make by laying-on of hands*.' See *op. cit.* p. 206, where it is said that a certain Alexander was consecrated by St. John Chrysostom; ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκείνου χειρῶν ἐπίσκοπος ἀνεδείχθη τῆς Βιθυνῶν Βασιλινουπόλεως.

d. 'There is the remarkable fact that the passage of the *Apostolical Constitutions* [viii. 4. 2-6], which describes with elaborate minuteness the other ceremonies with which a bishop was admitted to office, says nothing of this. It is mentioned that during a prayer after the election the deacons hold the open Gospels over the newly-appointed bishop's

[1] *Ep.* lv. 8.

head: but of imposition of hands the passage makes no mention whatever' (p. 133). This was the only apparently strong point in Dr. Hatch's plea. The passage (referred to above, p. 138) describes a solemn rite by which a man is consecrated to a priestly office. Three bishops stand by the altar, others with the presbyters praying in silence, and 'while the deacons hold the divine Gospels open upon the head of him who is being ordained' (χειροτονομένου), the chief bishop offers a long prayer of consecration. At the end of which 'one of the bishops is to lift up the sacrifice [i.e., the oblation] upon the head of him who has been ordained (χειροτονηθέντος), and on the morrow he is to be enthroned.' Are we to conclude that there is here represented a consecration without laying-on of hands? This is very improbable because (1) the ceremony is specified in the case of the bishop, as of the presbyter and deacon, in the *Church Order* of Hippolytus upon which the ordinal in the Constitutions is based; see above, p. 132, and the earlier part of this note: (2) it is specified in the *Constitutions* in the case of the presbyter and deacon (viii. 16. 2, 17. 2): (3) in the same book of the *Constitutions* (viii. 46. 9) a passage occurs sufficient to disprove the hypothesis: ἴστε γὰρ πάντως ἐπισκόπους παρ' ἡμῶν ὀνομασθέντας καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους εὐχῇ καὶ χειρῶν ἐπιθέσει, τῇ διαφορᾷ τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν πραγμάτων δεικνύοντας· οὐ γὰρ ὁ βουλόμενος παρ' ἡμῖν ἐπλήρου τὴν χεῖρα [i.e. was consecrated: from 1 Kings xiii. 33] . . . ἀλλ' ὁ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ—'bishops and presbyters and deacons were appointed by prayer and the laying-on of hands.' Presumably, therefore, in the rite as described the laying-on of hands is implied in the word χειροτονεῖν.[1] The word was supposed, in the fourth century at least (see quotations from Chrysostom and Jerome p. 343), to have that implication. *Apost. Const.* viii. 28. 2, 3 distinguishes χειροθετεῖν, i.e., to lay on hands in other rites than ordination, from χειροτονεῖν='to lay on hands in ordination.' χειροτονεῖν is a technical term for one special sort of laying-on of hands: Dr. Hatch (p. 133 n.[1]) has missed the mark when he translates it 'to appoint.' In many cases it may and does mean this: but in regard to ordination it means, in the usage of the compiler of the *Constitutions*, to ordain by laying-on of hands. Thus in ii. 23 τὴν χειροτονίαν λαμβάνων corresponds to 'cum manus impositionis accepit' in the Latin version of the *Didascalia*: and in

[1] It should be noticed that 'manual acts' are often omitted in early sacramentaries. Thus the directions for the manual act of laying on hands is omitted in some of the accounts of the rite of ordination in the Ordo Romanus; e.g. ap. Hittorp. p. 31 [ed. 1591, p. 22] we have simply 'consecrat illos,' although a late date is indicated by the mention of the incense being blessed, the introits, the litany, the vestments; cf. *ib.* p. 107 [p. 77]. On the other hand it is specified in an 'ordinal' which Dr. Hatch (*Dict. Chr. Ant.* s.v.) thinks represents one of the earliest remaining western types (Hittorp. p. 88 [p. 63]; Martene, Ordo ix, *Ant. Eccl. Ritus* ii. p. 151). It is not specified in Martene's Ordo i (*op. cit.* p. 86 f.), nor in a very brief order in Muratori *Lit. Rom. Vet.* i. p. 512 f., nor in the Maronite rite (in Morinus *de S. Ord.* pars ii. p. 419 f.). It is only later that 'ritualia,' giving complete rubrical directions, are written.

viii. 23. 2, 24. 2, 25. 2, when it is said of confessor, widow, and virgin (in contrast with reader, subdeacon, and the major orders) *οὐ χειροτονεῖται*, the author meant, not that no appointments were to be made, for he goes on to specify under what conditions a widow is to be enrolled (*κατατάσσεσθαι*) in the body of widows, but that the appointment was not effected by the laying-on of hands.

e. Dr. Hatch goes on to quote (pseudo) Albinus Flaccus as saying, in his account of the form and manner of episcopal consecrations at Rome, of 'the several ceremonies of holding the Gospels over the ordinand's head, and of the imposition of the hands of the bishops present, "non reperitur in auctoritate veteri neque nova; sed neque in Romana traditione."' Possibly: the imposition of the book of the Gospels was originally (see pp. 88, 89 n.[1], 138, 326 n.[1]) an Eastern not a Roman custom; and in the Hippolytean *Church Order* (see above, p. 132), while all the bishops present do in fact lay on their hands, the actual consecration is subsequent to this, and is performed by one bishop only. This is the point of our author: he is contrasting consecration by several bishops with consecration by a single bishop. The concluding words of the preceding sentence are 'benedicit eum,' and there is not the least reason to suppose that this benediction was effected in any other than the usual way, namely, by laying on of hands. Some things were so obvious that there was no necessity to be always mentioning them.

II

Now what was the significance attached to this laying-on of hands?[1] It was conceived of as giving ministerial authority, and not only authority, but something which accompanied the authority—a gift of special grace empowering a man for its exercise.

Thus, in the fifth century, Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus, the literalist interpreter of a temper which Dr. Newman characterizes as 'English'—no less than the mystic writer who passes for Dionysius—believed

[1] Dr. Hatch has endeavoured to minimize the significance attributed to it, quoting Jerome, Augustin and pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (*B. L.*[2] p. 135 and *Dict. Chr. Ant.* ii. p. 1508). Jerome no doubt says that the value of the outward rite lay, in one respect, in its preventing the possibility of people being ordained without their knowing it: 'ordinatio clericorum non solum ad imprecationem vocis sed ad impositionem impletur manus, ne scilicet, ut in quibusdam risimus, vocis imprecatio clandestina clericos ordinet nescientes' (*in Isai.* lviii. 10)—a function which it fulfilled but imperfectly, as we know from some curious stories of Theodoret (*Relig. Hist.* xiii, xix). But it was much more than this to Jerome, as we have seen (pp. 158, 337); the whole rite made a man a priest, with sacerdotal powers and authority. St. Augustin also says (*de Bapt.* iii. 16. [21]): 'Quid est aliud [manus impositio] nisi oratio super hominem?' But he is not speaking of ordination, but of the reconciliation of heretics, which he distinguishes from the gift of the Holy Spirit in confirmation. The laying-on of hands in ordination did, according to Augustin (see pp. 176, 177) 'impose a sacrament' which was indelible. The pseudo-Dionysius sees in the laying-on of hands more than 'fatherly sheltering and subjection to God': it *ἐμφαίνει τὴν τελεταρχικὴν σκέπην, ὑφ' ἧς . . . ἕξιν καὶ δύναμιν ἱερατικὴν ὁρουμένης*, κ.τ.λ. (*Eccl. Hier.* v. 3. 3: cf. Morinus *de S. Ord.* pars ii. p. 58).

that the laying-on of hands conveyed a specific grace of order. He believed this even when the rite was administered to a man without his knowledge. He records (*Relig. Hist.* xix.) how a bishop, wishing to ordain a recluse, got into his cell by surreptitious means and 'laid his hand on him and performed the prayer and then spoke at length to him and made plain to him the grace which had come upon him.' He regarded the grace as given by the laying-on of hands in virtue of the prayer which invoked the Spirit. 'We ought,' he says, commenting on 1 Tim. v. 22, 'first to examine the life of the man who is being ordained, and so to invoke upon him (καλεῖν ἐπ' αὐτόν) the grace of the Spirit.'

In the fourth century we have found (pp. 145, 146) St. Gregory of Nazianzus conceiving with great richness of thought of the effect of ordination; and speaking of St. Basil on his deathbed as '*giving his hand and the Spirit*[1] in ordination of the most genuine of his followers.' So St. Basil himself, speaking of those who had left the Church, says: 'they had no longer the grace of the Holy Spirit upon them; its communication failed when the succession was broken off (τῷ διακοπῆναι τὴν ἀκολουθίαν). For those who first went into schism had their ordinations from the fathers, and *through the laying-on of their hands they had the spiritual gift*; but those who broke off, having become laymen, had neither the authority to baptize nor to ordain, being no longer able to impart to others the grace of the Holy Spirit, from which they had themselves fallen.'[2] We have already (p. 144) heard St. Athanasius explaining to the recalcitrant Dracontius, that in being ordained he had received a grace of the Spirit, which was in him whether he liked it or no, and for the exercise of which he was responsible. The prayer for the ordination of a bishop in the *Apostolic Constitutions* runs: 'Thyself [O God], now by the mediation of Thy Christ, *pour out through us* [the ordaining bishops] the power of Thy ruling Spirit' (δι' ἡμῶν ἐπίχεε τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ σου πνεύματος, viii. 5).[3] St. Peter in the Clementine Homiles is represented as laying-on hands and invoking for him who is being made bishop the authority to bind and loose aright (*Hom.* iii. 72; cf. *Ep. Clem. ad Iac.* 2).

When we turn to the West we find a similar set of conceptions attached to the ordination of the clergy. The Roman writer Ambrosiaster in his *Quaestiones V. et N. T.* speaks thus (*Qu.* xciii. 2): 'When the Lord is said to have breathed on the disciples a few days after His resurrection and to have said "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," authority over the sacraments is meant (ecclesiastica potestas

[1] The early Church did not use the imperative formula, 'Receive the Holy Ghost.' St. Augustin certainly implies this (*de Trin.* xv. 26 [46]). But no more is implied in this formula than in saying, 'I baptize,' or (as St. Gregory in this case) 'he gives the Holy Spirit.'

[2] *Ep.* clxxxviii. can. 1.

[3] With the exception of the two words δι' ἡμῶν, this is repeated direct from the Hippolytean *Church Order* ἐπίχεε τὴν παρὰ σοῦ δύναμιν τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ πνεύματος.

intelligitur esse)[1] . . . and because it really belongs to the sphere of the Church (ad ius ecclesiasticum), He adds "Whose sins ye retain," etc. This inbreathing of Christ is a certain grace, which by succession is infused into those who are ordained (per traditionem infunditur ordinatis), by which they are to be made more acceptable.' He then quotes St. Paul's words to Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 14) and explains that this outward act of Christ was enacted 'ut ex eo traditioni ecclesiasticae Spiritus sanctus infusus credatur.' In his commentaries on the Pauline epistles, he speaks more definitely (see App. Note F, pp. 335, 336) of the 'grace of ordination' as attached to the laying-on of hands. 'He only,' says Lucifer (*de S. Athan.* i. 9), 'can be *filled with the virtue of the Holy Spirit for the governing of God's people, whom God has chosen, and on whom hands have been laid by the catholic bishops*, as Moses' hand was laid upon Joshua.' We have seen that St. Cyprian understood by ordination the laying-on of hands (p. 342), and that he regarded ordination, when rightly administered in the Church, as bestowing sacerdotal authority (p. 153). His conception is illustrated by that of a contemporary, perhaps also African, bishop, the author of the *de aleatoribus*, already cited in this note: 'Since we bishops have through the laying-on of hands received the same Holy Spirit within the shelter of our breast, let us cause no sadness to Him who dwells within us.'[2] Before Cyprian, the great theologian Hippolytus uses the following language as to the relation of the Holy Ghost to the ministry (*Ref. Omn. Haer.* proem.): 'No other will refute these errors save the Holy Ghost given in the Church, which the Apostles first received and then imparted to right believers; and forasmuch as we are their successors, sharing the same grace of high-priesthood and teaching, and accounted guardians of the Church, we shall not suffer our eyes to sleep.' The same idea finds a marked expression in his *Church Order*: see the prayer for the consecration of a bishop, pp. 132, 133 *supra*. Irenaeus also regards church officers as endowed with special spiritual gifts; he speaks of 'the presbyters who hold the succession from the Apostles, who with the succession of the episcopate have received the sure gift of truth (charisma veritatis) according to the good pleasure of the Father' (IV. xxvi. 2): 'God, says St. Paul, hath set in the Church first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers; where, then, the gifts of the Lord have been set, there we should learn the truth' (IV. xxvi. 5). Lastly, though Clement of Rome does not, any more than Irenaeus, allude to the ceremony of ordination, he connects the mission

[1] That is to say, as he explains in the next paragraph, the first gift of the Spirit was that which belongs to Church authority, *ad ius ecclesiasticum*, for the sacraments: the second was the great gift of the Spirit to all at Pentecost: the third was the temporary gift of working miracles.

[2] *De aleat.* c. 3: 'Quoniam episcopi idem [? eundem] Spiritum sanctum per impositionem manus cordis excepimus hospitio, cohabitatori nostro nullam maestitiam proponamus.'

of the ministry with that one mission by which 'Christ is from God, and the Apostles from Christ' (c. 42).

Such, then, is the continuous conception of churchmen in respect of the grace of ordination and the rite of laying-on of hands; and it has its origin in the simple and decisive expressions of the New Testament. The laying-on of apostolic hands was, as the evidence of the Acts assures us, the method of imparting the gift of the Spirit, and, as a natural consequence, it was also the method of ordination to Church office. It was through laying-on of hands by St. Paul, in company with the presbytery, that Timothy had received a 'gift of God' which remained 'in him,' and which he was urged to 'rekindle' into flame (1 Tim. iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6). As in the case of baptism, the Church gave a new meaning, a new reality, to an old Jewish rite.[1]

H.

MONTANISM.

(*See pp.* 189 *ff.*)

THE true nature of Montanism seems to emerge very clearly from an examination of the ancient writings bearing on it, which are not of very considerable bulk. They are mainly—(i) the anti-Montanist writers of the second, or early third, century, quoted by Eusebius *H. E.* v. 16-19; (ii) Didymus *de Trin.* especially iii. 41; (iii) Epiphanius *Haer.* xlviii (both these writers drawing on more ancient sources); and (iv) the Montanist writings of Tertullian, its chief western advocate. There are also important references in Hippolytus *Ref. Omn. Haer.* viii. 19, and pseudo-Tertullian *de Praescr.* 52. Other references are collected, and all the sources analysed, in Bonwetsch's admirable *Gesch. des Montanismus* (Erlangen, A.D. 1881), § 1; cf. also Harnack *Dogmengesch.* i. pp. 318-331 [ed. 4, A.D. 1909, pp. 426-438]; and *Dict. Chr. Biog.* s.v. MONTANUS (Dr. Salmon).

From these authorities it appears—

1. That the primary claim of Montanus and his followers was that of supernatural inspiration. Montanus claimed to be a passive organ through which Almighty God spoke—apparently even to be Almighty God, in the sense that his voice was God's voice. A similar claim was made by his prophetesses, Prisca (Priscilla) and Maximilla. In this consisted the New Prophecy (Epiphan. *Haer.* xlviii. 11, 12; Didymus *de Trin.* iii. 41; and the anonymous presbyter ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 16).[2] The inspired utterances of these first Montanist prophets were

[1] Cf. Loening *Gemeindeverfassung*, pp. 72 ff.

[2] The claim to speak with the voice of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost indiscriminately, carried with it, according to Didymus, a confusion of the Divine Persons (*l.c.* and elsewhere): and the Greek Fathers of the fourth century habitually

collected and reckoned by the Montanists as additional scriptures (*συντάττειν καινὰς γραφάς*, Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 20. 3); Tertullian constantly quotes them as inspired oracles (see *de Exh. Cast.* 10.; *de Res. Carn.* 11; *de Fuga* 9, 11; *de Pudic.* 21; *adv. Prax.* 8, 30; *adv. Marc.* iii. 24). If the highest sort of inspiration was supposed to belong to these prophets only (and the Fathers taunt them with the cessation of the gift), yet 'revelations' continued in the society. Tertullian quotes, to prove the materiality of the soul, the visions of a 'spiritual' sister who 'had the gift of revelations' (*de Anima* 9). As claiming inspiration, the Montanists claimed to be in a prophetic succession. They claimed to succeed to the ancient prophets and to those of the new covenant (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 17. 3, 4).[1] They argued that their inspiration was only a new instance of an old phenomenon (see the Montanist preface and conclusion to the Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas, and note especially 'things of later date are to be esteemed of more account' just because they are later. The Church judged them on their claim. She 'tried the spirits,' and decided that this was a case not of supernatural inspiration but of false prophecy, or even demoniacal possession. As thus judged and condemned, they were excommunicated by the Asiatic Churches, and the orthodox held them in such horror that they would not even under persecution die with them (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 16. 22). The Montanists were afterwards excommunicated at Rome also (see esp. *Dict. Chr. Biog.* iii. pp. 936, 938, 944).

The arguments used against this Montanist claim seem to have been

(*a*) that the prophetic gift failed with the death of the first claimants to it (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 17. 4):

(*b*) that their prophecies of wars and revolutions and the speedy end of the world did not come true (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 16. 19, and Epiphan. *l.c.* § 2):

(*c*) — the earliest and most important argument — that whereas prophecy in the Church was *rational* and the prophet *intelligent and conscious*, Montanist prophecy was, on their own showing, an irrational frenzy: cf. *ἐν κατοχῇ τινι καὶ παρεκστάσει ἐνθουσιᾷν . . . ὡς ἐπὶ ἐνεργουμένῳ καὶ δαιμονῶντι . . . τὸ βλαψίφρον πνεῦμα . . . λαλεῖν ἐκφρόνως . . . ἀμετροφώνους προφήτας* (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 16. 7, 8, 9, 12); cf. the title of Alcibiades' (Miltiades'?) anti-Montanist work, *περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν*; Epiphan. *l.c.* §§ 3-7; and Tertullian's expressions 'ecstasin . . . excessum sensus et amentiae instar,' 'amentiam . . . spiritalem vim qua constat prophetia' 'ecstasin . . . id est amentiam' (*de Anima* 45, 21, *adv. Marc.* iv. 22).

treat Montanism as heretical. Epiphanius, however (*l.c.* § 1), says the Montanists were orthodox on the doctrine of the Trinity. The pseudo-Tertullian draws a distinction in this respect between two sects. Tertullian makes their orthodoxy emphatic.

[1] There is perhaps no reason to make this claim an afterthought, with Harnack *Dogmengesch.* i. p. 323 n. [ed. 4 p. 430 n.[2]].

It was, then, mainly on account of its irrational, ecstatic, and therefore unchristian, pagan character that Montanism was rejected.[1] The point to observe is that the Church judged it on its claim. It claimed to be a new, special, supernatural inspiration, and the Church decided, not that such inspiration had ceased with the Apostles, but that *these people were not divinely inspired.* The Church had contained men and women recently whom it recognised as prophets, such as Quadratus and Ammia. It would not recognise Montanus and Maximilla on account of the character of their supposed 'gifts.' No doubt this repudiation of Montanist prophecy inclined the Church to regard the prophetic gift as having altogether ceased. See Epiphan. *l.c.* § 3. Irenaeus indeed, like Justin, speaks of prophecy as continuing in the Church: 'we hear of many brethren in the Church having prophetic gifts' (II. xxxii. 4, v. vi. 1); cf. Justin *Dial. c. Tryph.* 82: παρὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ μέχρι νῦν προφητικὰ χαρίσματά ἐστιν. The Muratorian fragment, on the other hand, speaks of the 'completus numerus' of the prophets; and Origen puts them almost wholly in the past, *c. Cels.* vii. 8 ἴχνη ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ [the prophetic spirit] παρ' ὀλίγοις. Alcibiades (Miltiades), against the Montanists (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 17. 4), speaks of prophecy 'as remaining in the whole Church until the second Coming,' but in what sense is not plain. In any case that supernatural prophecy had ceased was not a principle; it was an experience. See on this the account Tertullian gives of the rejection at Rome of the Montanist prophecy (*adv. Prax.* 1). If the Montanists taunted the Church with rejecting prophecy, the Church replied: 'we do not believe you are inspired.'

2. The Montanists claimed that their prophecy was 'new' in a special sense. They *acknowledged its novel character* (see Epiphan. *l.c.* § 8 οὐχ ὅμοια τὰ πρῶτα χαρίσματα τοῖς ἐσχάτοις—a Montanist saying). They asserted (says Didymus) '*that Montanus had come, and had the completeness of the Spirit.*' The Spirit promised by Christ had come in him. The age of the Spirit, through the Montanist revelations, had superseded the hitherto imperfect Church. Didymus is at pains to prove, as against them, that Montanus could not be greater than the Apostles: that the Apostles had had the Spirit in His completeness from Christ, and had imparted Him by laying-on of hands to the Church (*l.c.* § 2).[2] The Montanist claim finds very complete expression in Tertullian (see above pp. 189 ff.). If he also claims that Montanism is a 'restitutio' (*de Monog.* 4), this is only in the sense that it restores a severity of discipline about second marriages, which *the Apostles had allowed to remain relaxed*, owing to human weakness:

[1] As a matter of fact Montanus probably brought his idea of inspiration from his Phrygian paganism. According to Didymus (*l.c.* § 3), he had been a pagan priest; perhaps, as Jerome seems to imply, a priest of Cybele ('semivirum,' *Ep.* xli. *ad Marcellam* § 4). On the purely pagan character of 'ecstasy' see Bonwetsch *op. cit.* pp. 65, 66.

[2] The Montanist claim is expressed otherwise thus: 'in apostolis Spiritum sanctum fuisse, Paracletum non fuisse' (pseudo-Tertull.^{d} *Praescr.* 52).

it restored, that is to say, the primeval severity of the divine intention, but it was even here an advance on apostolic Christianity. See, on this *new* character of Montanist illumination, Harnack *l.c.* pp. 319-323 [ed. 4, pp. 426-430], and Bonwetsch, esp. *Die Prophetie in apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalter* in *Zeitschr. f. k. Wissenschaft u. k. Leben*, Heft viii and ix, 1884.

3. However true it may be that some at least of the Montanist claimants to prophetic inspiration were self-seeking charlatans (see Apollonius ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18), there is no reason to doubt that Montanism was really, even at first, *a movement in the direction of ascetic puritanism.* No doubt the establishment of the new Jerusalem in the 'little Phrygian cities of Pepuza and Tymium,' where Montanus 'would have gathered together' the children of the new dispensation 'from all sides,' was one of the many attempts which church history records to found a 'pure Church.' There the elect expected to behold the 'Jerusalem which is above' descend from heaven (Epiphan. *l.c.* § 14). It was mainly the puritan rigorism of Montanism, with its special fasts (*νηστειῶν νομοθεσία* is a feature noticed by Apollonius ap. Euseb. *l.c.*) and ascetic restrictions on marriage, that commended it to the impatient zeal of Tertullian. There was no doubt a tendency to worldliness, a 'Verweltlichung,' in the Church of the third and fourth centuries, just so far as she was allowed to live at ease, which accounts for, and in part excuses, if it cannot justify, the outbreaks of puritan fanaticism to which the history of the Church in those centuries bears repeated witness.

4. If men making a claim to inspiration would inevitably, in any case, have a tendency to look down upon church officers who made no such profession, much more were the repudiated and excommunicated Montanist claimants put into the most marked hostility to the Church. Their belief in the new dispensation of the Spirit tended to make them regard the Church as antiquated; in their puritanism they would have regarded her as corrupt, perhaps as unchurched by corruption; their expectations of an immediate *παρουσία* made them disparage her organization, which aimed at permanence.[1] Thus they would have every motive for setting 'the Church of the Spirit' against 'the Church of the bishops,' for setting personal inspiration against official authority, and ascetic severity against sacerdotal claims. As a fact their ascription of the power of absolution to spiritual men—in opposition to church officers—is a feature hinted at by Apollonius: 'who [amongst you Montanists] forgives sins to whom?' he asks in ridicule, 'does the prophet forgive the martyr his robberies, or the martyr the prophet his covetousness?' (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18. 7). In Tertullian this feature appears more prominently; see above p. 190 f.

[1] See especially Bonwetsch *Montanismus* p. 139: 'Allem dem entgegenzutreten, wodurch die kirchlichen Verhältnisse eine dauerndere Gestalt zum Zweck des Eingehens in eine längere geschichtliche Entwicklung erhalten sollten.' This was modified in later Montanism.

I.

PROPHECY IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

(*See pp.* 216, 238.)

THE words of Jesus Christ, 'all the prophets and the law prophesied until John,' are clearly not to be understood as excluding prophecy from His kingdom. If His own language is not without ambiguity,[1] yet in the apostolic writings the evidence is abundant. There are prophets in the Church who rank only next to apostles: see Eph. iv. 11, iii. 5, ii. 20, 1 Cor. xii. 28, Acts xi. 27, xiii. 1, and xv. 32. We should gather that not all persons who received at one moment or another the gift of prophecy, as in Acts xix. 6, would have ranked as prophets. The prophet would have been a person who *habitually* possessed the prophetic inspiration.[2] There was an abundance of the prophetic gift in the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. xiv. 29-39), and the prophets appear here as members simply of the local community; but speaking summarily they belong to the general, as opposed to the local, ministry, and rank with apostles and evangelists and teachers (see esp. Eph. iv. 11, iii. 5, ii. 20, and Acts xiii. 1, where Barnabas and Saul rank amongst prophets and teachers).

We get a clear idea of the characteristics of Christian prophecy.

1. In marked contrast to the idea of a prophet in Plato and in Philo,[3] St. Paul insists that the Christian prophet is no unconscious, passive instrument of the Spirit. Prophecy is rational, and subject to the will of the prophet in a remarkable manner; see 1 Cor. xiv. and especially verse 32: 'the spirits of the prophets' (cf. Apoc. xxii. 6) 'are subject to the prophets,' also Rom. xii. 6, and Acts xxi. 4, 11, where St. Paul seems to regard prophetic utterances as misdirected in intention though true in fact. St. Paul indeed on one occasion was the subject of something like an ecstasy. But it afforded no material for his public ministry; it was a blessing only for his own spirit, and we only hear of

[1] But see St. Matt. vii. 22, x. 41: elsewhere He speaks of false prophets (vii. 15, xxiv. 11) or Old Testament prophets (St. Luke xi. 49-51) or couples prophets with 'wise men and scribes' so that the language becomes analogical (St. Matt. xxiii. 34, cf. x. 41).

[2] So Meyer on 1 Cor. xiv. 31, and Bonwetsch *Die Prophetie in apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalter* in *Zeitschr. f. kirchl. Wissenschaft u. k. Leben*, 1884, Heft viii, p. 413, and ix, on whom this note is largely based. It should also be noticed that the existence of these distinctive prophets is not inconsistent with the gift of prophecy being given to the whole Church, see Acts ii. 17, 18.

[3] See Bonwetsch *l.c.* p. 415. He gives excellent references showing how essential to the idea of prophecy in these writers is its ecstatic character: *οὐδεὶς ἔννους ἐφάπτεται μαντικῆς ἐνθέου* (Plat. *Tim.* 72a), *ἐξοικίζεται ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ νοῦς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θείου πνεύματος ἄφιξιν* (Philo *Quis Rerum Divin. Heres* 265 [p. 511]). It was because Montanist prophecy was of this irrational, ecstatic character that the Church rejected it.

it through an allusion made fourteen years afterwards (2 Cor. xii. 2-4). St. John's Apocalypse is a special form of prophecy of most direct inspiration (cf. Apoc. i. 3, 10, iv. 2, xxii. 7, 10, 18, 19), but St. John clearly retains his consciousness and personality throughout the revelations made to him, and the function of prophecy is defined in general terms as 'the testimony of Jesus' (xix. 10) and regarded as continuing into the new covenant (xi. 18, xviii. 20).

2. The Christian prophet is no individual oracle. He is one of a body, and his gift exists for the good of the whole body. Accordingly it is subordinated to the regulative authority in the body, in the interest of order: see 1 Cor. xii. and xiv. 4, 5, 12, 17, 29-33, 40. Our Lord had directed that prophets were to be known by their moral fruits (St. Matt. vii. 15, 16). St. John also directs that utterances claiming inspiration should be tested by the rule of faith (1 John iv. 1-3, 2 John 7-11; cf. 1 Thess. v. 19-21).

3. We should gather from the Acts that Christian prophets foretold, like Agabus; see Acts xi. 28, xxi. 11. So St. Peter exercises prophetic power (Acts v. 3-10) and the Spirit guides the Apostles on critical occasions by specially communicated directions or prohibitions (Acts x. 19, xiii. 2, xvi. 6, xx. 22, 23). St. Paul (1 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14) says that Timothy was pointed out for his office by prophecies, and that prophecy was the means by which he came to receive his 'gift.' It is also the prophetic function to exhort and confirm and edify (Acts xv. 32 *παρεκάλεσαν, ἐπεστήριξαν*, cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 3 *οἰκοδομή, παράκλησις, παραμυθία*). Further in Acts xiii. 1-3 prophets (and teachers) appear as ministers of the Church's worship and they are represented as laying their hands after fasting and prayer upon Saul and Barnabas. On this occasion, however, the laying-on of hands recognised, rather than gave, apostolic commission,[1] and a supernatural intimation led up to it; so that it was an exceptional event. But it is probable that those who could enact the rite on this occasion could have done so under more ordinary circumstances, for 'ordination' or 'confirmation.' Who but Barnabas—one of these prophets (xiii. 1)—can have laid hands on the Antiochene Christians for the bestowal of the Spirit? See Acts xi. 22 and cf. viii. 14. It falls in with the 'liturgical' function of prophets, that St. Paul implies that there were such things as inspired prayers as well as inspired exhortations. There is a praying and praising which is by both the spirit and the reason, a 'eucharist' to which the private Christian can say his Amen with an intelligent assent, and which is none the less 'in the Spirit' (1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16).[2]

[1] In the general sense; it is to be regarded, however, as giving them the *commission of the Church at Antioch* for a particular work indicated supernaturally by the Spirit—'the work whereunto He had called them.'

[2] In 1 Cor. xiv. 16 *ἐν πνεύματι* must, I think, mean 'in spirit only,' i.e. in an unintelligible tongue; as opposed to a blessing of the Eucharist 'in spirit and in reason'—such a prayer as St. Paul himself would have prayed.

The gift of prophecy continued as a recognised endowment of the Church into the second and even the third century. Certain people were recognised as prophets, e.g. Ignatius, Polycarp, and Quadratus, already referred to (pp. 250, 254). As in the apostolic Church there had been prophetesses, so too they had their late representative in Ammia at Philadelphia (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 17. 3). St. Irenaeus, besides denouncing false prophets (*adv. Haer.* IV. xxxiii. 6), protests against those who would banish prophecy from the Church under pretence of exposing such pretenders (III. xi. 9: 'propheticam . . . gratiam repellunt ab ecclesia') and witnesses, like Justin Martyr, to the continuance of prophetic gifts in his own day (II. xxxii. 4, V. vi. 1; Justin *c. Tryph.* 82). Even an opponent of the false prophets of Montanism recognises that prophecy must continue in the whole Church to the end (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 17. 4). The Montanist prophets were rejected by the Church specially on account of the ecstatic and irrational character of their supposed gifts. Their rejection involved no slight at all on the gift of prophecy and no denial of its claims. As a matter of fact, however, the genuine gift seems to have become exceedingly rare; Origen speaks only of slight traces of it remaining to his time (*c. Cels.* i. 46, vii. 8).

The documents of the subapostolic age are of special interest for this subject—the *Didache* and the *Shepherd* of Hermas. In the *Didache* the true prophet is distinguished from the false 'by his fruits,' i.e. by his genuine poverty and disinterestedness and by his orthodoxy. So far he is subject to the testing of the Church. But when once his true prophetic inspiration is accepted, it becomes a sin against the Holy Ghost to judge him; see xi. 1, 2, 7-13. The remarkable feature in the prophets of this document is that, like those at Antioch in the Acts, they become, wherever they appear, the chief ministers of worship, no less than of teaching, and hold, with the less defined figures of apostle and teacher, the first rank in the church hierarchy. The *Didache* is, as was said above (p. 254), the last document in which prophets appear clothed with this higher dignity. After that prophetic bishops take the place of episcopal prophets. There is not, however, as was pointed out (p. 255), sufficient reason to assert that the latter ever held their quasi-apostolic position in the Church on the mere ground of their prophetic gifts, without ordination.

In the *Shepherd* Hermas appears as the recipient of veritable visions which are to be communicated to the Church. If thus he is to be considered as a true prophet, he gives us also a vivid picture of the false prophet inspired of Satan (*Mand.* xi), whose characteristic is self-seeking and ambition, and who is represented sitting on a 'cathedra,' answering the questions of those who come to consult him. No spirit given from God, says Hermas, is thus questioned, but speaks of itself according to the divine power given. The spirit which is questioned and answers according to the lusts of men is earthly and fickle. Again, in order to secure reputation, the false prophet isolates himself and prophesies in a corner, whereas the true prophet only speaks

(where the pretender is dumb) in the congregation of just men. Again, the false prophet is ambitious of ecclesiastical preferment, he desires the 'chief seat,' while the true prophet is humble and meek. Again, the false prophet requires to be paid before he will speak. Thus the true and false prophets are to be distinguished by their conduct.

It is clear that at the time of the *Shepherd* the prophet did not hold anything like the position which he held in the *Didache*. No doubt the abundance of pretenders to inspiration made it plain that prophecy, even if an abiding endowment of the Church, was a rare one and not intended for the Church to depend upon for a supply of her chief ministers. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* we have a clear intimation of the transitory character of the miraculous 'charismata' of the early Church, and of prophecy among them. The Apostles are there represented as declaring that, in contrast to the fundamental spiritual gift which is the essence of Christian life, miracles were only vouchsafed in view of the conversion of the world and would become superfluous when all were Christians; accordingly those who possess the exceptional gifts are warned not to exalt themselves on that account over the church rulers: and the exorcist, in spite of the gift of healings which marks him for his special office without any ordination by laying-on of hands, is yet required to be ordained in the usual way, 'if there be need that he should become a bishop or presbyter or deacon.' See *Apost. Const.* viii. 1 and 26.

On the theory that the functions of the prophet passed in a certain sense to the reader of the early Church, see p. 254 n.[3]. When Ambrosiaster[1] tries to explain St. Paul's catalogue, Eph. iv. 11, in terms of the orders of the ministry familiar to his own day, and defines the prophet as the expounder or interpreter of Scripture, he was thinking, not of the reader, but of the presbyter, 'qui ordo nunc potest esse presbyterii': thus he equates apostle with bishop, prophet with presbyter, evangelist with deacon, pastor with reader, teacher with exorcist.

[1] See Cornelius a Lapide on Eph. iv. 11, referring to 'Ambrose' (i.e. Ambrosiaster) *in loc.*

K.

THE ORIGIN OF THE TITLES 'BISHOP,' 'PRESBYTER,' 'DEACON,' WITH REFERENCE TO THE THEORIES OF DR. HATCH.

I. THE purpose of this note is, first, to offer evidence for what has already been advanced on this subject in the text (pp. 216-220, 227, 235-236).

A. The title PRESBYTER is derived confessedly from the organization of the Jews,[1] but in order to show that the Christian organization was not imitated from the Jewish *as a whole*, it is necessary to give some account of what the Jewish organization was, as far as we know it, both in Jerusalem and in 'the dispersion.'[2]

This Jewish organization was fourfold.

(1) There was the priestly organization for the purpose of the temple worship, with high-priest, priests, and Levites. This, however, did not of course exist anywhere except at Jerusalem.

(2) Representing the traditional religious learning amongst the Jews, we find, both in Jerusalem and in the dispersion, the recognised order of the scribes, who may be said to have taken the place of the prophets. Their name occurs commonly in the Jewish inscriptions found at Rome.

(3) For the purposes of the synagogue worship, both in Jerusalem and throughout the Jewish world, there was an ἀρχισυνάγωγος, with his ὑπηρέτης or clerk, or several ἀρχισυνάγωγοι (see Acts xiii. 15; cf. St. Mark v. 22, where, however, the reference may be to the rulers of different synagogues; for the ὑπηρέτης see St. Luke iv. 20). The 'ruler of the synagogue' selected and regulated the readers or preachers.

(4) For judicial and disciplinary purposes there was a πρεσβυτέριον, or body of πρεσβύτεροι, of whom we hear often in the New Testament (e.g. St. Luke xxii. 66, Acts xxii. 5) as constituting the sanhedrin. Apparently, however, this name was not much used except at Jerusalem: there is one instance in an inscription at Smyrna (*C.I.G.* 9897), but Schürer does not find the word in the Roman inscriptions.[3] In the

[1] However, as the reverence for age is universal, so we have not only the ancient Greek γερουσία, but a later use of πρεσβύτεροι for members of a γερουσία, at least in Asia Minor. See Hatch *B. L.*[2] pp. 65, 66.

[2] The following account is largely derived from Schürer *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit*, Leipzig, 1879. His results have been verified by Kühl in *Die Gemeindeordnung in den Pastoralbriefen*, Berlin and Neu Ruppin, 1885, p. 117.

[3] These Roman inscriptions belong apparently to the third or fourth century A.D. The word πρεσβύτερος occurs once among the Hebrew inscriptions found at Venosa, in South Italy, perhaps of the sixth century and later: see a paper of Ascoli in the

Jewish communities at Rome[1] we have ἄρχοντες or 'rulers' (in St. Matt. ix. 18 however ἄρχων = ἀρχισυνάγωγος of St. Mark v. 22, ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς of St. Luke viii. 41; and see Acts iv. 5, 8), presided over by a γερουσιάρχης, who was *primus inter pares*. These presidents are called οἱ πρωτεύοντες τῆς γερουσίας by Josephus *Bell. Iud.* vii. 10. 1 (= *maiores* or *primates*). The ἄρχοντες seem to have been elected annually;[2] cf. (pseudo-) Chrysostom *Opp.* [ed. Paris, 1588] ii. p. 1086: 'Qui [Iudaei] cum a Deo secundum Mosem initium anni mensem Martium acceperunt . . . mensem Septembrem ipsum novum annum nuncupant, quo et mense magistratus sibi designant quos et archontas vocant.'

These four organizations were essentially distinct, though it might happen that the presbytery at Jerusalem might consist of 'high-priests and scribes,' as in St. Luke xxii. 66 (but on the other hand see Acts xxii. 5), or that an ἄρχων at Rome might also be an ἀρχισυνάγωγος (as in Schürer's inscriptions 19, 42), or a priest an ἄρχων (inscr. 5). Besides these officers we hear also of the title of 'father' or 'mother of the synagogue' being given to persons of age or influence.

This sketch of the Jewish fourfold organization will suffice to show within what limits the Christian Church can be described as having borrowed from it. The important points to notice are two.

First, that the Christian Church borrowed none of the Jewish titles except that of 'presbyter.' Epiphanius indeed mentions (*Haer.* xxx. 18) that the Ebionites used the title ἀρχισυνάγωγος—just as they also, he goes on to say, used the word συναγωγή instead of ἐκκλησία—, but this is an instance of reversion, for there is no evidence for the use of the title in the Christian Church. Lucian again, the pagan, speaks of Peregrinus as προφήτης καὶ θιασάρχης καὶ ξυναγωγεύς of the Christians, but this last title was recognised no more than the second in the Church. The Christian place of meeting is indeed called a συναγωγή by St. James (ii. 2); but this is the only case in which it is used in the Christian Church in the specific Jewish sense, though the Ebionites, as we have just seen, used the term, and a Christian passage in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* endeavours to supply a Jewish colouring by speaking of Gentile Christian churches as 'synagogues of the Gentiles,' and their ministers as 'archons' (*Benj.* 11). For the

Atti del IV Congresso degli Orientalisti, Florence, 1880, vol. i. pp. 239 ff.; esp. p. 281, note 2, 292 and 350. Kühl, *op. cit.* p. 117, discounts this on account of its date. Also the more frequent occurrence of the female form πρεσβυτέρη (*sic*) indicates that the word has no longer its official meaning: Ascoli says, 'piuttosto dev' esser titolo d'onoranza, che non di vera dignità, poiché gli sta accanto la πρεσβυτέρα.'

[1] At Alexandria, it should be noticed, the Jews formed one community under one Gerusia: at Rome, on the contrary, they constituted a number of separate communities (or 'colleges' in the eye of the State), each with its own synagogue and officers. The Christians in Rome, before they were organized into a church, seem to have formed a number of separate congregations (see Rom. xvi. 5, 14, 15).

[2] It is said that they often held office for life, and that on this account an archon came to be known as διάβιος (*diabius*), but Ascoli denies this latter assertion, and regards διὰ βίου as an exclamation or condensed prayer, see *l.c.* p. 344.

use of συναγωγή in the more general sense of a gathering, see Ignatius *ad Polyc.* 4 and Lightfoot's note, Hermas *Mand.* xi. 9, Heb. x. 25. The Christian 'council' is also called a συνέδριον in Ignat. *ad Magn.* 6, *ad Trall.* 3, *ad Philad.* 8, but, as is noted below (p. 363 n.[1]), in the way of metaphor.

Secondly, that the Christian Church had only one gradually developed organization. It is true that this organization embodied various principles—the principle of authority and rule, the power derived from inspiration or spiritual gifts, the veneration due to age, and the devolution of special tasks on special executive officers, owing to the natural exigencies of organization.[1] It is true also that amongst the Jews the same person might be at once a scribe, a ruler of the synagogue, and a presbyter—that is, the distinct organizations might be represented by the same person. Still it remains the case that all our evidence goes to show that the Christian Church had only one organization, while the Jews, with their temple, schools, synagogue, and sanhedrin, had four. All the functions and powers of Ministry were, in fact, summed up at first in the Apostles—with whom, however, must be reckoned other 'prophets' in whom the Church recognised a supernatural inspiration —and were gradually imparted under their authority and leading to different officers, who shared the same ministry in distinct grades. Thus, if the function of *worship*, which in the Christian Church formed the spiritual counterpart of the temple λειτουργία, was (as Harnack rightly says[2]) 'the primary function' of the episcopate, if it was the bishops' office to 'offer the gifts' (Clem. *ad Cor.* 44), yet they are said to share the λειτουργία of the prophets and teachers in this respect (*Did.* xv. 1); and these prophets and teachers are in the Acts specially brought before us as fulfilling this same function of worship (Acts xiii. 2). Then, again, with reference to the function of *teaching*. This 'ministry of the word' or 'stewardship of the mysteries of God' belongs primarily to apostles and prophets with teachers or evangelists, but it is shared also by the 'bishops' (1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 9), and the local 'pastors' are called 'teachers' (Eph. iv. 11). Once again, if the presbyterate as derived from Judaism held the *judicial* and disciplinary function (Acts xv. 2), yet in the Christian Church the Apostles are the chief ministers of discipline (cf. 1 Cor. v.; Acts xv. 2), and the presbyters, as will be shown, were also bishops, and, as such, teachers and leaders of worship; they share, in fact, the whole apostolic pastorate (Acts xx. 28-31; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2), and in St. James's Epistle they perform a function which involves a spiritual ministration (James v. 14): later, when they are distinct from the bishop, they sometimes

[1] See Harnack *Texte u. Untersuch.* B. ii, Heft 2, p. 146 f. He calls the last three principles the spiritual, the patriarchal, and the administrative: and adds as a fourth, under the label 'aristocratic,' the development of Christian devotion in saints, ascetics, or martyrs, connecting with this the evolution of the episcopate.

[2] *Dogmengesch.* i. p. 155 [ed. 4 p. 236]; cf. *Expositor*, May 1887, pp. 340-342. He includes the *deacon* also. The matter is discussed below, p. 366.

indeed appear as the special ministers of discipline, as in the Ebionite Clementines (*Ep. Clem. ad Iac.* 7-10; *Hom.* iii. 67, 68), but even so under the bishop (*Ep. Clem. ad Iac.* 2, 3, 6) and not to the exclusion of the deacons (*Ep. Clem. ad Iac.* 12; *Apost. Const.* ii. 44, 57, viii. 28). Finally, if the *administration of alms* was in some special sense a function of the diaconate in its original idea, yet it does not cease to be part of the apostolic office to organize almsgiving (see Gal. ii. 10, 2 Cor. viii., etc.), nor should it surprise us to find it specially mentioned in connexion with the presbyterate (Acts xi. 30; Polycarp *ad Phil.* 6, 11; cf. *Apostolic Church Order* c. 18), though when the presbyterate came to be the name for a distinct office from the episcopate, the function of the administration of alms came to belong generally to the bishop, with the assistance of the deacons (Hippolytus *Church Order* iii. 3).

B. The title EPISCOPUS was common among the Greeks. In Attic it is used for a commissioner 'appointed to regulate a new colony or acquisition,' whom the Spartans would have called a 'harmost.' Among writers of the period of the empire, it is used by Arrian for the inspectors employed by Indian kings; by Appian for a commissioner appointed by Mithridates in Ephesus;[1] by Dionysius of Halicarnassus for the inspectors of agriculture whom Numa Pompilius is supposed to have instituted.[2] It is used also in inscriptions of the Haurân (a district of the ancient Bashan) for civic officers who seem to represent the 'agoranomi,' 'episcopi qui praesunt pani et ceteris venalibus rebus quae civitatum populis ad quotidianum victum usui sunt' (so Charisius, a jurisconsult of Constantine's time, explains their office, *Digest.* l. 4. 18); and also for 'committees' appointed to superintend any work, see Le Bas et Waddington *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure*: *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines, partie vi* (*Syrie*) 1990, 2298, 2308—the last of these three inscriptions commemorates the restoration of a conduit and temple in Commodus' time at Soueida [Soada] ἐπισκοπούσης φυλῆς Σομαιθηνῶν. It seems also to be used for the officer of a guild, though his functions are not clear.[3] MM. Le Bas and Waddington remark in their comment on no. 1990 (tom. iii. p. 474): 'il est intéressant de rencontrer si près du berceau du christianisme le mot ἐπίσκοπος appliqué à un fonctionnaire civil. C'est là, peut-être, que les apôtres l'ont pris pour le donner aux premiers surveillants et directeurs des communautés chrétiennes.'

[1] For the references see Lightfoot *Philippians* p. 95.

[2] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* ii. 76: διεῖλε τὴν χώραν ἅπασαν εἰς τοὺς καλουμένους πάγους καὶ κατέστησεν ἐφ' ἑκάστου τῶν πάγων ἄρχοντα ἐπίσκοπόν τε καὶ περίπολον τῆς ἰδίας μοίρας.

[3] Hatch *B. L.*[2] pp. 37, 38, and notes 26, 27, 28. The matter is not of great importance. Dr. Lightfoot calls the evidence 'slight' (*Dissertation* p. 194). So also Kühl pp. 93-96. Sanday, *Expositor*, Feb. 1887, pp. 98-100: 'I confess that I cannot quite satisfy myself as to the evidence which has been adduced to show that this was a standing title for the financial officer of the clubs or guilds.' Salmon, *Expositor*, July 1887, p. 19: 'The proof offered is extremely meagre.'

So far then we have seen cause at least to recognise that there was a wide use of the term ἐπίσκοπος in Greek of the imperial period, and especially in Syria, for an administrative officer, which must clearly have suggested or facilitated the Christian use of the term. On the other hand the word had a use in the LXX of the Old Testament. 'In the LXX,' says Dr. Lightfoot,[1] 'the word is common. In some places it signifies "inspectors, superintendents, taskmasters," as 2 Kings xi. 19, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12, 17, Is. lx. 17; in others it is a higher title, "captains" or "presidents," Neh. xi. 9, 14, 22. Of Antiochus Epiphanes we are told that when he determined to overthrow the worship of the one true God, he "appointed commissioners (ἐπισκόπους, bishops) over all the people," to see that his orders were obeyed (1 Macc. i. 51: comp. Josephus *Ant.* xii. 5. 4; in 2 Macc. v. 22 the word is ἐπιστάτας). The feminine ἐπισκοπή, which is not a classical word, occurs very frequently in the LXX, denoting sometimes the *work*, sometimes the *office*, of an ἐπίσκοπος. Hence it passed into the language of the New Testament and of the Christian Church.' Dr. Sanday quotes this passage,[2] and adds: 'If ἐπισκοπή had its origin in the usage of the LXX, is it not reasonable to derive ἐπίσκοπος from the same source?' He argues in favour of this position with great force, and calls attention to the fact that Clement of Rome refers back the institution of Christian bishops to the authority of Isaiah.[3] It should be added that St. Peter speaks of Judas' apostolate, with reference to Ps. cix. [cviii.] 8, as an ἐπισκοπή (Acts i. 20). On the whole, if contemporary secular usage had a good deal to do with the use of the term 'episcopus' in the Christian Church, it is probable that Old Testament usage had at least as much influence. Obviously the two influences are very likely to have combined. The name has no more definite meaning than that of 'superintendence.' On being adopted by the Apostles, it would have gained from the first a new colour from the spiritual character of the supervision which the Christian communities required: the Christian presbyters were charged by St. Paul to 'take heed unto themselves, and to all the flock, in the which the Holy Ghost had made them bishops to feed [rule] the Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood.'[4]

C. The title DEACON (Phil. i. 1) does not seem to have been derived from any Jewish or pagan source, but to have been a natural application of the more general idea of ministry to the wants of others, so specially characteristic of Christianity; see St. Luke xxii. 26, 27.

[1] *Philippians* pp. 95, 96.

[2] *Expositor*, Feb. 1887, p. 102.

[3] Is. lx. 17, quoted by Clem. *ad Cor.* 42 as καταστήσω τοὺς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει. It is quoted also by Irenaeus with a similar purpose, but from the LXX, without alteration.

[4] Acts xx. 28. Dr. Sanday (*Expositor*, Feb. 1887, p. 100) inclines to think that the bishop's superintendence was of persons, and specially of deacons: the bishop, that is, was the superintendent of deacons: this passage in Acts, however, does not favour such a view. He also suggests (with Kühl), that, as the verb διακονεῖν preceded the title διάκονοι, so the verb ἐπισκοπεῖν may have preceded the title πίσκοποι. But there is no evidence of this.

D. The titles 'presbyter' and 'episcopus' were used interchangeably for the same officers; see esp. Acts xx. 17, 28, Titus i. 5, 7.[1] At the same time it is natural to suppose that the title 'presbyter' would have seemed more natural in Jewish communities, and the title 'episcopus' among Gentile Christians. Thus in fact St. James, and probably St. Peter (see 1 Pet. v. 2 R.V. marg.), uses only the former title. But the distinction cannot be pressed. The Jewish *Didache* knows only the title ἐπίσκοπος (xv. 1). On the other hand the officers at Ephesus are known as presbyters as well as 'episcopi' (Acts xx. 17; 1 Tim. v. 17, 19; cf. Acts xiv. 23). It is natural also to suppose that the term ἐπίσκοπος was more definitely the title of an office, while πρεσβύτερος, with its vaguer application to the dignity of age (cf. 1 Pet. v. 1-5; Clem. *ad Cor.* 1. § 3; Polycarp *ad Phil.* 5. 3, 6. 1; in all these cases in contrast to youth[2]) represented rather a position of respect (see above p. 137). Thus Theodore of Mopsuestia, while he acknowledges that 'presbyter' and 'episcopus' are used interchangeably, yet justifies the use of the 'presbytery' for ὁ τῶν ἀποστόλων σύλλογος (as he thinks) in 1 Tim. iv. 14, with these words: πρεσβυτέριον αὐτὸ ὀνομάσας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐντίμου (Swete ii. p. 150). 'Presbyter,' he elsewhere explains, was a title of respect as amongst the Jews, while the same persons who were called 'presbyters' were also called bishops ἀφ' οὗπερ μετήεσαν καὶ ἔργου, τῷ μάλιστα πᾶσιν ἐπισκοπεῖν (in 1 Tim. iii. 8, Swete ii. p. 120). But this distinction again admits of being pressed very little way. All the evidence goes to show that the presbyterate was a definite office to which the Apostles appointed men (Acts xiv. 23) and that the presbyter was also called a bishop.

E. The presbyter-episcopi exercised a pastorate of souls (1 Peter v. 2, Acts xx. 28). They shared with the Apostles the stewardship of God (Titus i. 7). They took their share in teaching and admonishing (1 Thess. v. 12, etc.; though there may perhaps have been some who did not teach, 1 Tim. v. 17). They administered sacraments and sacramental rites (Clem. *ad Cor.* 44, *Didache* xv. 1, James v. 14). They also administered discipline and, in part at least, charity. In fact they were, under the Apostles and apostolic men, the spiritual 'presidents' of the Churches.

II. In view of this positive position we have now to examine the speculations[3] especially connected with the names of Dr. Hatch and Professor Harnack.

(*a*) Dr. Hatch lays stress upon the fact noticed above that the

[1] See Dr. Lightfoot's note, *Philippians* pp. 95 ff.

[2] But the presbyters in all these cases are also definite officers; cf. the term κλῆροι (='allotted charges') in 1 Pet. v. 3.

[3] The earlier speculations to which Baur gave the chief impulse have been noticed above, p. 224 n.[2]. They were connected primarily with the question of the authenticity of the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles, and with the general theory of the Tübingen school which is bound up with this question. They treated the development of the ministry only secondarily.

Jewish communities possessed distinct organizations from different points of view, the presbyterate constituting the organization for the purpose of discipline. He supposes the Christian Church to have derived from Judaism not only the title of the presbyterate, but also its functions, unchanged. 'It may be gathered,' he says (*B. L.*[2] p. 57), 'from the Talmud that out of the elders or chief men of every community a certain number had come to be officially recognised, and that definite rules were laid down for their action. Side by side with the synagogue of a town, but distinct from it, was the *συνέδριον* or local court. The former was the general assembly, or "congregation" of the people: the latter was the "seat" of the elders.' So in the Christian Church 'there is a strong presumption that the officers who continued to bear the same names in the same community exercised functions closely analogous to those which they had exercised before; in other words, that the elders of the Jewish communities which had become Christian were, like the elders of the Jewish communities which remained Jewish, officers of administration and of discipline' (*ib.* p. 62). This derivation of functions from Judaism to Christianity was facilitated in Dr. Hatch's view, as this quotation will have shown, by the very gradual transition which he supposes to have taken place from the older Jewish to the Christian religion. 'When the majority of the members of a Jewish community were convinced that Jesus was the Christ, there was nothing to interrupt the current of their former common life. There was no need for secession, for schism, for a change in the organization. The old form of worship and the old modes of government could still go on. The weekly commemoration of the Resurrection supplemented, but did not supersede, the ancient Sabbath. The reading of the life of Christ and of the letters of Apostles supplemented, but did not supersede, the ancient lessons from the prophets, and the ancient singing of the psalms. The community as a whole was known by the same name which had designated the purely Jewish community. It was still a *παροικία*—a colony living as strangers and pilgrims in the midst of an alien society. . . . The same names were in use for the court of administration and for the members of that court: and even the weekly court-days remained the same' (*ib.* p. 60).[1] Thus the Jewish Christian communities derived from the Jewish a presbyterate of men of age and gravity, for purposes of

[1] The general idea of this paragraph will be criticized further on. Here a few details need notice:

(1) There is no evidence quoted of a Jewish community of 'the dispersion' calling itself a *παροικία*. The Jewish instance of the word quoted p. 61 n.[16] is from the LXX and refers to the Captivity. All the other instances given are Christian.

(2) The Christian presbyterate is compared to the *συνέδριον τῶν ἀποστόλων* in Ign. *ad Magn.* 6; so in *ad Trall.* 3, *ὡς συνέδριον θεοῦ καὶ ὡς σύνδεσμον ἀποστόλων*: in *ad Philad.* 8 it is called the 'synedrion of the bishop.' But in none of the cases is the presbyterate called the sanhedrin in the Jewish sense, officially, still less so by the 'Fathers of the fifth and sixth centuries.'

(3) There is no reference given for the weekly court-days remaining the same.

'administration and discipline.' The origin of the episcopate was different. 'The officers of administration and finance [in the contemporary non-Christian associations] were chiefly known by one or other of two names'—*ἐπιμελητής* or *ἐπίσκοπος*.[1] This latter title then was borrowed to express the administrative officer of the Christian communities; and, as the primary administration is supposed by Dr. Hatch to have been financial, so the primary function of the primitive 'bishop' was financial administration.[2] On this point Dr. Hatch's theory was modified by Prof. Harnack in the *Analecten* to his German translation of Dr. Hatch's work, and Dr. Hatch himself explained that he was 'wrongly supposed to lay any exclusive or even especial stress upon the financial character of the *ἐπίσκοποι*.'[3] The presbyterate was, then, a disciplinary board derived from Judaism, the episcopus was an administrative officer derived from the contemporary guilds.

This theory of Dr. Hatch was developed by Prof. Harnack, and while the former in his *Bampton Lectures* had taken up no decisive position about the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles and Acts, the latter boldly declared all these documents to belong to the second century (with the Epistle of St. James), and in developing his theory was at pains to explain that it was intimately bound up with the critical position. Having thus given himself free scope for writing on the *origines* of the ministry by abolishing so much of the evidence, he supposed that the office of the episcopus was originally quite distinct from that of the presbyter, and that there was a partial fusion, followed again by a fresh separation in the monarchial episcopate of later days.[4]

[1] *B. L.*[2] p. 36 f.

[2] *B. L.*[2] p. 39: 'in their special capacity as administrators of church funds they were known by a name which was in current use for such administrators.'

[3] See Dr. Hatch's explanation in *Expositor*, Feb. 1887, p. 99, note [1], and his communication to Dr. Harnack's *Dogmengesch.* i. p. 155 [ed. 4 p. 236], note [1]. This latter may indicate that he would not (after the discovery of the *Didache*) have disagreed with Harnack's assertion that the 'episcopi and diaconi were primarily officers of worship'; cf. *Expositor*, May 1887, pp. 339-342; *Texte u.s.w.* l.c., p. 144. This explanation of Dr. Hatch's renders unnecessary a good deal of criticism (as by Kühl and others). It also makes it difficult to see the point of his arguments and references on pp. 47, 48.

[4] See Harnack, in *Expositor*, *l.c.* pp. 334, 335. His theory is explained by Dr. Sanday, *Expositor*, Jan. 1887. Dr. Hatch on the other hand says that 'the weight of evidence has rendered practically indisputable' the identity of presbyters and episcopi in the New Testament (*B. L.*[2] p. 39). Dr. Sanday calls this 'something that looked a little like a concession to the older view' (*l.c.* p. 12 n.). It seems to me inconsistent with the episcopi and presbyters representing different organizations. With reference to this view as carried out by Harnack with 'more uncompromising logic,' it would appear that the evidence of such passages as Acts xx. 28, Titus i. 5, 7 (whenever written), and of Clem. *ad Cor.* 44, was enough to overthrow it. No passage can be produced in which there are signs of a distinction being drawn between presbyters and episcopi, existing together, till the later distinction of the monarchical episcopate. Nor, in view of Polycarp *ad Phil.* 5 *ὑποτασσομένους τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις*, can the connexion of the title diaconus with that of episcopus be pressed as if the deacons were in no relation to the presbyters. It is

(*b*) Dr. Hatch, regarding the functions of presbyters as judicial or disciplinary and those of the episcopus as administrative in an almost secular sense, treated the local officers of the Christian churches as originally hardly 'spiritual' persons: 'the ministration of the word and sacraments' was a later conception of the presbyterate.[1] He also supposed that their office was only temporary. Here again, however, Prof. Harnack modified the idea, maintaining that the episcopate and diaconate, as distinct from the presbyterate, ranked as *charismatic*, and were therefore 'almost free from control.'[2]

Enough has been said earlier in this note on the identification of the presbyters and the bishops, and on the 'spiritual' functions of the presbyter-bishops. It should, however, be pointed out further with reference to other parts of Dr. Hatch's theory, that:—

1. The title 'presbyter' was chiefly, if not exclusively, in use amongst the Jews of Jerusalem, and its use in the churches would therefore indicate not the gradual organization of Christian communities side by side with the Jewish, and on their model, all over the empire —in which case we should have had Christian *archons*—but the derivation of the Christian communities from Jerusalem as a centre.

2. Though the Christianity represented on one level by St. James and on a much lower level by the *Didache* may be described as a gradual transition from the old to the new covenant, this was not an ordinary position. Not only the Epistle to the Thessalonians and the Acts of the Apostles, but that most Jewish of New Testament documents, the Apocalypse, witness to the marked hostility of the Jews to the Christians, and therefore to the marked separation of the Christian communities.[3] The Jews of Palestine 'expelled' the Christians, says

probably an accident that we do not hear more of presbyters and deacons in conjunction. Later no doubt the deacon was attached specially to the monarchical bishop, but still the clergy are often described as presbyters and deacons, as e.g. by Clem. Alex. in *Strom.* vi. 13.

[1] *B. L.*[2] pp. 72-82.

[2] *Analecten zu Hatch* p. 234 note [1]; but in *Expositor*, May 1887, p. 333, he speaks of Clement as first maintaining the lifelong character of the episcopate.

It will be seen at once that this conception as developed by Prof. Harnack rested upon the repudiation of the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles as representing authentic history and the mind of St. Paul. But this repudiation, at any rate as regards the Acts, is, as we have seen (pp. 2 n.[1], 4 n.[3]), entirely inconsistent with Harnack's later view as to the date of the book. Therefore, though it seemed necessary to retain in this note some account of the qualifications which he introduced in restating Dr. Hatch's theory, it must not be assumed that they would represent without still further modification his present attitude.

[3] So even in the *Didache* (viii. 1) we have the suggestive direction: 'Let your fasts not be with the hypocrites; for they fast on the second and fifth days of the week, but do ye fast on the fourth and the preparation day [Friday]. Neither pray ye as the hypocrites.' The language of the Apocalypse is also very noticeable, see ii. 9; 'the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan.' Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 15, on the hostility of the Jews of Judaea, 'who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets and drove out us.' See Dr. Lightfoot *Philippians* p. 190, and a criticism by Dr. Hilgenfeld in *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.*, 1886, p. 5: 'solcher Uebertritt ganzer oder fast ganzer jüdischer Gemeinden zum Christus-Glauben wird sehr selten vorgekommen sein.'

St. Paul, and where this did not occur, the process is described by Dr. Lightfoot as a secession resulting in the establishment of a separate synagogue. There was no process of 'continuity without a break.'

3. The evidence for 'episcopus' as an officer of contemporary guilds is exceedingly slight. For this statement I need not add to the references given above, except to mention that Harnack seems to agree as to the inadequacy of the evidence:[1] 'Inquiries about the place and character of such an office in civil constitutions do not afford any solution of the problem. No other meaning can be given to the word than that of "overseer"; but what sort of an oversight such overseers exercised cannot be more precisely determined.'

4. Dr. Hatch underrates strangely the intense consciousness of the Christians, especially of the Christian Apostles who organized the churches, that 'all things had become new.' Whatever elements of organization or practice the Christian Church may have derived from external sources, Jewish or even pagan, they were fused at once by the 'one Spirit' into the 'one body,' and gained with immense rapidity a quite new set of associations. Christian institutions must be interpreted from within as the Christians understood them. It was by a simple application of this principle, in contrast to Dr. Hatch's method, that Harnack reached the speedy conclusion that 'bishops are originally the directors of the worship, the offerers κατ' ἐξοχήν. They are called overseers insomuch as they direct or superintend the assembly met for worship. Out of this function all others have been necessarily developed.'[2] Probably if Prof. Harnack had then given the weight he would now give to some documents of the New Testament, he would have so far modified his verdict as to extend the original oversight of the bishop to all the concerns of the flock. But at least it was a decision based primarily on an investigation of what Christians thought of their own institutions, and the result was therefore the exaltation to the first place of the spiritual function. Dr. Hatch, by his method of giving exaggerated weight to external associations and connexions and ignoring the primary evidence from within, as he dispiritualized the episcopate, so he did the same for the Eucharist. He rightly deduced the connexion of the bishop with the Eucharist from such passages as Justin Martyr *Apol.* i. 67 and Ignatius *ad Smyrn.* 8,[3] but the nature of the Eucharist may also be gathered from these passages, and how subordinate a place does charitable relief hold in it by comparison to its great spiritual functions. How could it be otherwise when St. Paul wrote of it as in 1 Cor. xi. 17-34?

Dr. Hatch's references, one may notice, do not always suggest the idea in the text. For example, in support of the secular idea of the eucharistic administration, he remarks that the offerings made by those

[1] *Expositor l.c.* p. 339. [2] *Ibid. l.c.* p. 342.
[3] *B. L.*[3] p. 40 note[32] and pp. 79, 80. See in criticism Hilgenfeld *l.c.* p. 16 f.

who were present at that service seem to have been at first of various kinds; but afterwards a rule was made limiting them to bread and wine or corn and grapes (*Apost. Can.* 3); and still later, those which were not consumed at the time were divided in fixed proportions among the clergy (*Apost. Const.* viii. 31). But the canon he refers to is suggestive of a view of the Eucharist very different from what he is emphasizing; it runs thus: 'If any bishop or presbyter, otherwise than our Lord has ordained concerning the sacrifice, offer other things at the altar, as honey, milk, or artificial alcohol instead of wine, or birds or animals or vegetables, otherwise than is ordained, let him be deprived; excepting grains of new wheat, or bunches of grapes, in their proper season. For it is not lawful to offer anything besides these at the altar, and oil for the holy lamp, and incense in the time of the divine oblation. But let all other fruits be sent to the house of the bishop as first-fruits to him and the presbyters.'[1]

L.

THE TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

(*See p.* 247.)

THIS document was discovered in a MS. in Constantinople and given to the world in 1883 by Bryennios, archbishop then of Serres and afterwards of Nicomedia. Another edition of this and the related documents (the *Apostolic Church Order*, and Book vii. chapters 1-32 of the *Apostolic Constitutions*) by Dr. Harnack, in *Texte und Untersuchungen* ii 1, followed in 1884.[2]

It will be convenient first to summarize the contents and estimate the character of the document as it stands, then to examine briefly its relation to other documents, and finally to make some attempt to fix within rough limits its time and place.

[1] Prof. Ramsay (*Ch. in R. E.* p. 367) also suggested that the 'episcopus' did not originally hold a permanent office, but that the name was given to any presbyter appointed to 'superintend' a special work, particularly that of corresponding with foreign churches. Yet the 'episcopi' of Phil. i. 1, Acts xx. 28, Tit. i. 5-9, *Didache* 15, are permanent officials, identical with presbyters; and the title 'episcopus' is specially connected with the superintendence of the local church, Acts xx. 28, 1 Tim. iii. 5.

[2] Other discussions of the *Didache* that belong to the first years after its publication are:—P. Sabatier, *La Didachè*, Paris, 1885; P. Schaff, *The Oldest Church Manual*, New York, 1885; B. B. Warfield in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January 1886; C. Taylor, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, Cambridge, 1886—a very important commentary on the Jewish relationships of the book; G. Salmon, *Non-Canonical Books*, 1886, afterwards incorporated in the later editions of his *Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*. Some more recent contributions to the criticism of the book are examined below, pp. 373 n.[1], 374.

It may be divided into the following parts :—

1. Rudimentary moral instructions about *the two ways* of life and death, as an address to catechumens just about to be baptized (cc. i.-vi).
2. Instructions to a community of Christians, addressed as a whole, about the proper method of baptizing, the Christian fasts, the use of the Lord's Prayer, and the celebration of the Eucharist (cc. vii-xi).
3. Further instructions about 'apostles' and 'prophets,' in their relation to the local Church, about the Sunday service, and about the election and functions of the local ministry of bishops and deacons (cc. xi-xv).
4. A final section about the second coming of Christ (c. xvi).

The moral instruction is of an intensely Jewish character. It is indeed not wholly Christian—not by any means on the level of the Sermon on the Mount, or of St. James who has so profound a grasp on the principles of the 'law of liberty.' It belongs rather to the enlightened synagogue than to the illuminated Church. 'Whatsoever thou wouldst *not have done* to thee, neither do thou to another.' 'Thou shalt not hate any man, but some thou shalt rebuke, and for some thou shalt pray, and *some thou shalt love* above thine own soul.' 'If thou hast, thou shalt give with thine hands as a ransom for thy sins.' 'Fast for those who persecute you.' 'Let your fasts not be with the hypocrites: for they fast on the second day and the fifth, but do ye fast on the fourth day and the Preparation [Friday].' 'If thou canst bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou shalt be perfect; but if thou canst not, what thou art able to do, that do. As regards food, bear what thou canst. But from that which has been offered to an idol, be greatly on thy guard. For it is the service of dead gods.' This advice about 'bearing the yoke' and 'bearing the burden' of Jewish observance only up to a man's power, reveals the intensely Jewish atmosphere out of which it comes. It carries us back in its very language to the circumstances of the Apostolic Council (Acts xv. 10-28). It is also very noticeable that in place of our Lord's spiritualizing of the law, which makes the inward sin of intention equivalent to the outward act of commission (St. Matt. v. 28), we have in c. iii. a Jewish method of 'making a fence to the law,' which is a very different thing; 'Be not lustful, for lust leads to fornication,' etc. This impression of a Jewish tone about the moral teaching is deepened at every step of closer study.

Once again, the regulations given about baptism are thoroughly Jewish in character. In what sense? Not because they are minute regulations, but because baptism seems to be regarded, as a half-Christianized Jew might regard it,—as a *prescribed ordinance*, not as a means of grace. He seems to have no grasp at all of the sacramental principle. Baptism and (as we shall see) the Eucharist are ordinances of the Gospel, like prayer and fasting and alms-giving—nothing more.

The meagreness and inadequacy of the whole conception of the Eucharist strikes every one at once. It is fenced indeed by the preliminary requirement of baptism[1] and the injunction of previous public confession of sins;[2] it is regarded as the Christian sacrifice[3] or thank-offering,[4] in which is fulfilled the prophecy of Malachi about the 'pure sacrifice' of the new covenant (xiv. 3), and which, it is probably implied, our Lord alluded to when He spoke of 'bringing our gift to the altar';[5] it is also called spiritual food and drink (unless indeed these words refer to the *teaching* of Christ),[6] and is celebrated in definite anticipation of His second coming (x. 6): but the whole conception of it is more Jewish than Christian.[7] Sabatier says truly: 'Our document cannot but surprise those who read for the first time its liturgy of the Eucharist. We have here a form without analogy anywhere. It separates itself much less from the Jewish ritual than from the Christian.' 'It is an ordinary repast just touched by a breath of religious mysticism, such as is the outcome of the importance which belongs, in Jewish and oriental idea, to repasts taken in common.'[8] There is, in fact, nothing to recall to our mind our Lord's words in the institution of the Eucharist, of which, we must remark, we have the form given us in St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians,—nothing to recall to us St. Paul's language about the significance of the communion. It is a Jewish feast Christianized in

[1] ix. 5.

[2] xiv. 1: προ[σ]εξομολογησάμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, cf. iv. 14: 'In church thou shalt confess thy transgressions,' i.e. before public prayer.

[3] xiv. 1.

[4] c. ix.

[5] xiv. 2: 'Let no man who has a dispute with his fellow come together with you until they be reconciled [διαλλαγῶσιν, cf. St. Matt. v. 24], that your sacrifice be not defiled,' seems to refer to the saying of our Lord.

[6] x. 3. See Sabatier *La Didachè* p. 104.

[7] See Salmon *Introd.* p. 607. There are, however, indications that these prayers in the *Didache* are really prayers for the Agape, and that the actual communion is meant to occur after x. 6. The word Eucharist may well include the Agape. Thus the cup in ix. 2 corresponds (cf. St. Luke xxii. 17) to the second paschal cup. The expression 'after being filled' (x. 1) refers to the preliminary eating, and Dr. Taylor quotes a most suggestive parallel from Jewish language about the passover, p. 130: 'The chagigah was eaten first that the passover might be eaten after being filled.' Thus the occurrence of the Holy Communion after the Agape would rest upon a Jewish practice. Then the exclamations of *Did.* x. 6: 'If any one is holy, let him come: if any one is not, let him repent,' refer, as they naturally should, to the subsequent eating of the holy things. This again would explain the meaning of the rule of xi. 9, that the prophet who 'orders a table in the spirit' is, as a test of his disinterestedness, not to eat of it: he is not to eat of the Agape, not to 'fill himself,' and is, of course, to communicate at the subsequent Eucharist. This interpretation of the 'eucharistic' prayers would seem the most natural, I think, but for the immense difficulty for suggesting a reason for the silence about the Holy Communion, unless we can introduce the idea of reserve about 'the mysteries': cf. Taylor p. v. Perhaps, however, the difficulty is less great if these benedictions are based on formulas in use amongst the Jews at religious meals, as seems very probable; see Rendall *Theol. of Hebr. Chr.* p. 89 f.

[8] Sabatier, *op. cit.* pp. 109, 112.

a measure by the recognition of the Messiahship of Christ and the expectation of His second coming.

It must not indeed be supposed that the mere absence of later ritual would mean the absence of sacramental idea. This view has been combated already (pp. 163, 164). We find in some cases an absence of elaborate ritual coinciding with the fullest appreciation of the spiritual efficacy of a sacrament. In the *Teaching* it is the idea that is absent. This falls in further with the absence of grasp on the principle of the Incarnation. Of course Trinitarian doctrine is implied in the use of the Trinitarian formula of baptism,[1] but the author seems to be quite uninfluenced by the teaching of St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John on the Incarnation and the Atonement and the Holy Spirit. The Christology indeed is barely as full as that of the early speeches in the Acts. Perhaps, however, we can best characterize the tone of the *Didache* by saying that it would represent the beliefs of a Jewish Christianity yet unleavened by the deeper 'teaching of the Apostles,' which was to follow that first earnest emphasis on the Messiahship of Jesus, of which the early chapters of the Acts give us the record.[2]

Internal evidence then shows that the *Didache* is the work plainly of a Jewish Christian. He is conscious enough of his alienation from the Jews proper, whom he calls 'the hypocrites,'[3] and there is no sign of any insistence upon circumcision; but we must bear in mind that there was in the age preceding Christ's coming a widely spread school of liberalized Jews, who had come to regard their religion as

[1] Schaff maintains that the author of the *Didache* in the phrase 'Hosanna to the God of David' (x. 6) refers to Christ as God. If the reading is right, however, it more probably refers to the Father. Nor does the 'Lord' of xiv. 3 seem to refer to Christ as the Messiah of the Old Testament: it is a simple reference to the words of the original. It is not that the author is heretical, but he is inadequate.

[2] Certainly the connexion of the *Didache* with the language of St. Peter's first sermons, and with the phraseology of these chapters, is very striking. It is more than a coincidence of mere language.

(*a*) With ix. 2 Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς σου, cf. Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30. See Clement's Epistle, c. 59. In *Mart. Polyc.* 14, as in Hippolytus' *Church Order* and the *Apost. Const.*, it has a new meaning; it is no longer *servant* as in the *Didache* (used alike of David and Jesus in the same clause), with reference to the 'servant of Jehovah in Isaiah; it has got the meaning of 'Son'—'My beloved Son.' See Lightfoot on Clement, *in loc.*

(*b*) With x. 2 quoted above, and ix. 2, cf. Acts ii. 28 ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς.

(*c*) For the whole idea of the Acts, ii. 42 ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων . . . τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς, cf. ix. 3, xiv. 1, τὸ κλάσμα, κλάσατε ἄρτον.

(*d*) With iv. 8 συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ πάντα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου καὶ οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἴδια εἶναι, cf. Acts iv. 32 οὐδὲ εἷς τι . . . ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι . . . πάντα κοινά.

(*e*) For the coupling of fasting and prayer, cf. Acts xiii. 3.

(*f*) With vi. 1-3, on 'bearing the yoke' and 'guarding oneself from that which is offered to an idol,' cf. Acts xv. 10-28.

(*g*) 'The way' of life suggests the use of 'the way' in the Acts as a synonym for Christianity.

[3] **viii. 1, 2.**

the 'school of the knowledge of God and of the spiritual life for the whole world,'[1] and a Jew of this sort who had accepted Christ as the Messiah and become a member of His Church as being the way of life and learnt ardently to desire His second coming to establish His kingdom — such a Christianized Jew, living or having lived under circumstances which made him acquainted with the vices of the Graeco-Roman civilization,[2] must have been the author of our *Teaching*.

Of course there is teaching implied in the writing which is not given. Why should Christians 'fast on Wednesday and Friday'? The answer to this question at least implies a record of historical facts about our Lord, though not more. Why should God be glorified 'through Jesus Christ' (ix. 4)? Here is involved some doctrine of mediation. Why are Christians baptized into the name of the Son and the Spirit as well as of the Father? This must carry with it some teaching about the Persons represented by these Divine names. Thus there is a teaching implied which is not given, and apparently, we must add, not realized.

Our mind naturally goes back to those Jewish Christians to whom the Epistle to the Hebrews was written. Here were Christians who only half realized what their religion meant—who knew its 'first principles,' those which a Jew could most easily realize, 'repentance from dead works and faith toward God, the teaching of baptisms and of laying-on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.' Is not the Christianity of this *Teaching* very much the sort of inadequate Christianity which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews sought to lift into a complete realization of the divine majesty of Christ, of the mystery of His eternal high-priesthood and the Church's fellowship with Him and in Him? Not indeed that our document presents all the features of the Judaism which the author of that great Epistle had in view; there is no sign here of falling away, no craving after the 'worldly' ritual of the old covenant; but the instruction given in the *Didache* embodies 'first principles' closely resembling those which the Hebrews had made their own: the belief in God, and the moral duties of obedience and repentance which follow from that belief; the due and careful performance of the ceremonial and religious duties of religion, and the reverence due to its teachers; the keen expectation of 'the end' and the coming of the kingdom, with the judgment and the resurrection.[3]

So much for the character of the document as it stands. Something must now be said about its relation to other early Christian writings.

[1] This s Athanasius account of Judaism (*de Incarn.* c. 12). On the liberal Judaism of the Roman empire, see Harnack *Dogmengesch.* i. pp. 73 f. [ed. 4 pp. 121 f.].

[2] See the list of vices which characterize the way of death, c. v.

[3] Sabatier calls attention to the entire absence of any mention of women, as emphasizing its Jewish origin and early date (*op. cit.* p. 153): 'La plupart des documents d'origine juive ignorent la femme.

The simplest part of the problem is the relation of the *Didache* to the seventh book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Just as the author of the *Constitutions* took the *Didascalia* as his starting point for his first six books, altering and expanding his model just as he pleased, now with more, now with less, change, so for the first thirty-two chapters of his seventh book the *Didache* served him in the same capacity as the *Didascalia* had previously done. And so far as we can tell the *Didache* in the form in which he used it was exactly the document which we know to-day: though of course the MS. which the author of the *Constitutions* employed may have differed in detail from the MS. discovered by Bryennios, as any two MSS. of the same work may differ from one another, and each of them in turn may have preserved better readings.

The author of the *Constitutions* lived, it is fairly certain, in Syria: but as he wrote not earlier than the middle of the fourth century, we do not derive from him much assistance towards the dating of the *Didache*.

Equally late is the pseudo-Athanasian tract *de Virginitate*—perhaps belonging also to Syria and to the fourth century—in which the prayer of thanksgiving over the bread, *Didache*, ix. 3, 4, is reproduced as a sort of 'grace before meat,' § 13. A phrase from the same prayer, ix. 4, 'as this bread has been scattered on the top of the mountains and, gathered together, came to be one,' is incorporated in the Eucharistic prayer of an older contemporary of the author of the *Constitutions*, Bishop Serapion of Thmuis (see above p. 131): and Serapion, unlike the *de Virginitate*, even retains the phrase *ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων*, in spite of its incongruity with the conditions of Egypt.

More important for its relationship to the *Didache* is the tract often quoted in the present work, the so-called *Apostolic Church Order*, printed originally by Bickell in 1843 and reprinted in Harnack's edition of the *Didache*, pp. 225-237. Of this document the first half (chapters 4-13) is directly imitated from the *Didache*: but, unlike the author of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the author of the *Apostolic Church Order* only makes use of a part of his exemplar: with the exception of the single phrase *πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, from the prayer of thankgiving after the sacred meal, *Didache* x. 3, there is no certain trace of the use of any chapters outside the *Two Ways*, and even within these the section based on the Sermon of the Mount, *Didache* i. 3 ff., finds no counterpart in the *Apostolic Church Order*. The purely Christian character of the sources of that section stood in marked contrast with the rest of its context: and now that we find that it is not recognised in the *Church Order*, we may safely conclude that it is an interpolation into the original *Two Ways*. And also the Latin fragment (printed by Harnack, *op. cit.* pp. 277-278) is not only without it (it goes straight on from *Didache* i. 2 to ii. 1), but being headed *Doctrina Apostolorum* it shows that it was not merely a

pre-Christian form of the *Didache* which lacked this Christian section.[1]

Thus while there is no reason to doubt that the *Didache* as Bryennios recovered it represents the completest form in which this early Christian document was in circulation, it is obvious that it was not the only form. But in one form or another it was widely known as a book that hovered for some time on the outskirts of the New Testament canon. Eusebius mentions in this connexion τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγομέναι Διδαχαί (*H. E.* iii. 25. 4), and Athanasius classes a Διδαχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων among 'the books not admitted into the canon but appointed by the Fathers to be read to those who are just coming to us and desire to be instructed in the doctrine of godliness' (39th *Festal Letter*, A.D. 367). Whether or no these references are to the *Didache* as we possess it cannot be said for certain: with regard to a similar reference in the stichometrical list of canonical books drawn up by Nicephorus of Constantinople (*c.* A.D. 800), it is reckoned that the number of στίχοι given, if correctly preserved, can only apply to a Διδαχή of much smaller compass than that of Bryennios.

There remain for mention only the points of literary contact between the *Didache*, on the one side, and two sub-apostolic writings, the *Epistle* of Barnabas and the *Shepherd* of Hermas, on the other. The contact is undoubted, and there is reason to think that it is not entirely confined to the *Two Ways*. Harnack, holding as he did when he first published his edition, that the *Didache* depended on both Barnabas and Hermas, was bound to date the *Didache* the latest of the three. But his first judgment of the literary problem was overhasty, and it may be taken for certain that the *Didache* did not draw its description of the *Two Ways* from either of these Christian writers: though, of course, it is also possible that they (or at any rate Barnabas, the earlier of the two) did not draw on the *Didache* as we know it, but on some earlier form of the *Two Ways*.[2] And the solitary phrase that belongs in common to Barnabas and the later chapters of the *Didache*, ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν (ὑμῶν), may perhaps have been borrowed by the *Didache* from Barnabas as easily as by Barnabas from the *Didache*.

It is certain then that the *Apostolic Constitutions* depend on the *Didache* as we have it: and if the 'Christian' insertion in the *Two Ways* be set aside, it is probable that the *Apostolic Church Order* depends on the *Didache* also. But once it is granted that the *Two*

[1] A complete Latin version of the *Two Ways*, without the 'Christian' section, was published by Dr. J. Schlecht *Die Apostellehre in der Liturgie der katholischen Kirche*, Freiburg i. B. 1901.

[2] Not long before Bryennios' publication Dr. Krawutzcky of Breslau had reconstructed the *Two Ways* from the use of it made by Christian writers, and his reconstruction was found to be almost in the words of the *Didache*. Harnack (*op. cit.* p. 208) spoke of this as 'a critical masterpiece, such as we can point to but few examples of in the history of literary criticism.'

Ways was in independent circulation in a Christian form as the *Doctrina Apostolorum* or *Teaching of the* (*Twelve*) *Apostles*, such a hypothesis would satisfy most of the evidence supplied by the earlier writings enumerated above.[1] At what point in the first two centuries we place our *Didache* depends ultimately upon the view we take of the internal evidence of its contents, and of its relation to the canonical writings of the New Testament. And upon these points a decided reaction has taken place, at least in England, from the conclusions that were drawn a generation ago by the scholars who first dealt with the document.

The earliest criticism of what may be called the 'received' view was also the most thorough-going. Dr. Bigg, as long ago as 1898, published for the S.P.C.K. a translation of the *Didache*, with an introduction in which he boldly claimed that the book belonged to the fourth century. Dr. Bigg was an original thinker and a writer of great distinction: but he was not averse to paradoxes, and a fourth century date for the *Didache* is paradox and nothing more.[2] A much more serious assault was delivered by Dr. Armitage Robinson in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (xiii. 339) for April 1912: he propounded the thesis, and defended it with extraordinary resource, that the author of the *Didache* borrowed New Testament material from end to end of his work, though he was careful to cover up as far as possible all traces of the process. The Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul, have all contributed their quota: and the book is conceived to represent not any condition of things that ever existed as a whole in fact, but what an ingenious compiler thought he could extract from the New Testament as the sort of instruction that the Apostles in dealing with the topics selected might have been expected to give. Dr. Robinson declines to fix a date for the *Didache*: but the indications thrown out suggest that he would lean to a time soon after the middle of the second century. Mr. Edmundson, in his *Bampton Lectures* for 1913, followed on the same side: but the fullest review of the whole question is perhaps that given by Dr. Wotherspoon in the first two chapters of *The Ministry in the Church in relation to Prophecy and Spiritual Gifts* (1916). Dr. Wotherspoon, if he does not go so far as Dr. Bigg, is confident that the *Didache* cannot be earlier than the last quarter of the second century, and he would connect it rather closely with the Montanist movement and with Phrygia. He finds in it no suggestion of a primitive atmosphere, no conception of the mission of

[1] Yet Hermas *Mand.* ii. 4 is in obvious contact with *Didache* i. 5, *i.e.* with the 'Christian' insertion.

[2] Dr. Bigg's palmary argument was perhaps the occurrence in *Didache* xii. 5 of the word χριστέμπορος, which is not cited from any other author before Athanasius, though in fact χριστεμπορεία is used by Alexander of Alexandria. But people seem sometimes to forget that every word must have a first occurrence somewhere: and if Ignatius can coin χριστόνομος χριστοφόρος and χριστομαθία, why should not an older contemporary of his have coined χριστέμπορος?

the Gospel to evangelize the Pagan world, nothing like 'charismatic enthusiasm,' but on the contrary a legalistic tone, an official and professional, that is a degenerate, 'prophetism'—combined indeed with an 'air of conviction,' a 'background of reality,' which indicates that the writer is no mere recluse of the study, but in touch with some definite and missionary movement, in which the claim of prophecy, rightly understood, held a foremost place.

Now the pages in this volume already devoted to an account of the *Didache* (pp. 247-255 *supra*) will have shown that there is much in all this criticism with which the present writer can cordially concur. Already in the earlier editions of this book he had laid stress on the imperfect and inadequate character of the Christianity represented in the *Didache*: and in the thirty years which have elapsed since it was first published, he has come increasingly to feel not merely that the doctrine of the *Didache* is not the 'doctrine' of the apostolic churches, but that in the life of the community as there pictured the ambiguous character of the prophet suggests an origin for the document among churches alienated in spirit from their 'fellowship.' He would therefore subscribe with very little reserve to the protest these critics have made against the tendency to treat the *Didache* as typical in any respect of the condition of the Christian churches in the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles. Nevertheless, it looks as though at the present time we should have to be on our guard, in avoiding the danger of an over-valuation of the *Didache*, against falling into the opposite danger of unduly depreciating its date and its significance.

And first then of the point which Dr. Armitage Robinson has specially made his own, the relation of the *Didache* to the books of the New Testament. It may be that Dr. Robinson is right in holding that the author knew and used both the First Epistle to the Corinthians and the Gospel according to St. Matthew. But there is nothing either impossible or improbable in a writer of the end of the first century or beginning of the second, however remote his district or however backward his Christianity, being acquainted with an epistle written fifty years and a gospel written twenty-five years earlier. For the rest Dr. Robinson seems to underrate the mass of material in the Old Testament, in Jewish and Jewish-Christian liturgical language and customs, and in floating Christian tradition, which would be at the common disposal of any Christian writers by the year 100 A.D., and would account sufficiently for many of his supposed parallels. The marked agreement of the *Didache* with the subject-matter of the Acts, especially of the first five chapters, has already been emphasized (p. 370 n.[2]); but neither with regard to the Acts, nor with regard to the Pauline Epistles (other than perhaps 1 Cor.), still less with regard to the Gospel of St. John, does the evidence as a whole point to that intimate and conscious dependence upon the New Testament writers for which Dr. Robinson contends. The fundamental incompatibility

of the thought with that of St. Paul and of St. John makes such a conclusion improbable: we must not press too far some coincidences of language, where the underlying ideas are so different. Thus the connexion of the Church's unity with the unity of the bread in *Didache* ix. 4 is strikingly different from that in 1 Cor. x. 17, and the account of Antichrist in c. xvi. shows great independence of St. Paul's treatment, though acquaintance with the idea that he is using.

And with regard to St. John, the Vine of David (ix. 2) is the Church, not Christ, and suggests therefore ignorance of St. John xv. The phrase (x. 2) *εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἅγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν* [*ἡμῶν*] *καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου* is in fact a reference to Jerem. vii. 12 *κατεσκήνωσα τὸ ὄνομά μου*, and further suggests familiarity with the language used in the early chapters of the Acts, ii. 28 *ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς*, iii. 13 *ὁ ἅγιος παῖς Ἰησοῦς*, cf. iii. 26, iv. 27-30, language which again is in direct reference to the Old Testament. St. John never uses *ἀθανασία* or *γνῶσις*. Indeed 'Holy Father' is the only phrase which recalls St. John in his report of our Lord's Prayer, and our author is fond of the word *ἅγιος*. Altogether there is no reason to think he knew St. John's Gospel. Did he then know either of the other Gospels? The Lord's Prayer and the baptismal formula would be an element in any tradition. Beyond these we have only a record of 'sententious' sayings of our Lord, such as are most easily handed down in oral tradition: *οἱ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν* (but this may be direct from Ps. xxxvi [xxxvii] 11), *μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσίν, ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ* (iii. 7, ix. 5, xiii. 2). The acquaintance with our Lord's eschatological discourses shown in c. xvi. is very independent of the Gospels. Reference is made to 'the gospel of the Lord' (xv. 4), but it is doubtful whether this is a document.[1]

But if there is nothing in the relation of the *Didache* to the New Testament writings which would compel us to date it later than the beginning of the second century, we are free to turn back to the document itself, and ask what is the general situation into which it will best fit. We have seen already that it is permeated through and through with a Jewish spirit: and unless its presentation of the life and organization of the communities is quite irreconcileable with an early date, this strongly Jewish character of a writing which has come down to us after all through the Catholic tradition indicates a time when the Jewish-Christian communities were dropping out indeed from the main stream of Christian development, remained stereotyped and stunted in their apprehension of what Christianity meant, but were still in communion with the Church at large, and believed themselves to be building up their polity upon the foundation of apostolic teaching.

[1] See, however, on the whole question, Taylor, *op. cit.* pp. 108-112.

What then of this organized community life with its local bishops and deacons, with the missionary visits of apostle, prophet and teacher in the background? Where are we to locate a state of things in which prophets loomed so large, yet in which the need for proving and testing them was so insistent also? Not surely among the Montanists: Montanism made much more of the inspiration of the Spirit in the prophet, much less of the right of the community to reject him. Not among the Catholic communities of the middle or end of the second century, with whom the genuine prophet had become, apart from the episcopate, nothing but an interesting survival. Are we then to say with Dr. Robinson that the conditions represented n the *Didache* never did exist, but were imagined by a Christian student of archaeological tastes working on the New Testament material? There is every reason to doubt whether such scholarship had any existence in the Church of the second century: and even if it had, there is really no material in the apostolic writings out of which the prophet of the *Didache* could have been created.

But if we are free then in dating the *Didache* to give, what scholars who put it as late as the middle of the second century can hardly give, full weight to the indications of its fundamentally Jewish and Jewish-Christian character, we shall assign it to the first century or at latest to the earliest years of the second,[1] that is to say, to a time when the episcopate as we meet with it in Ignatius was in remote districts still unknown, and the Church's danger was as yet simple imposture and self-seeking rather than the prevalence of any definite heresy.

Have we any grounds on which to fix the district in which the *Didache* was written?

Harnack's suggestion of Alexandria or Egypt seemed to some of us excluded by the physical features alluded to in the words 'the bread scattered upon the mountains and gathered together,' ix. 4: and in spite of the fact that Bishop Serapion, whose prayers were not yet known when Harnack wrote, has, in borrowing from the *Didache* in his eucharistic prayer, retained the phrase, it still appears to be more natural to refer the original use of the words to northern Palestine (so Taylor p. 116) or Syria. Other indications were felt to point in the same direction. Thus, in vii. 2, there is a remarkable permission to baptize in warm water, where cold could not safely be used, and 'it stands recorded in the Gemara that a fruitless attempt was made in the days of R. Jehoshua ben Levi (cent. ii-iii) to obtain dispensation from the practice of purificatory immersion in certain cases, in the interest of the women of Galilee, who were said to be afflicted with barrenness by the cold. But it was permitted to warm the water for the use of the high-priest on the Day of Atonement, if he was aged or delicate' (Taylor pp. 54 f.). The Christian Judaism

[1] Sabatier would have us put it back as early as the middle of the first century, before St. Paul's Epistles: but its author doubtless escaped the influence of St. Paul rather by remoteness of situation than by priority in the date of writing.

of Galilee would appear here as granting to all what Pharisaic Judaism refused. Again, before Bryennios' publication of the *Didache*, Westcott and Hort had declared that there 'could be little doubt that the doxology [to the Lord's Prayer] originated in liturgical use *in Syria*';[1] and that doxology appears in our manual as a substitute for the Amen in Jewish fashion at the end of the eucharistic thanksgiving, as well as of the Lord's Prayer.[2]

The present writer is therefore still inclined to assign the document to Palestine or Syria, and to give the preference to an out-of-the-way district, such as that beyond the Jordan.

It remains only to add a few words on another aspect of the *Teaching*. Assuming its early date as now sufficiently demonstrated, its whole evidence goes to increase our belief in the archaic and Judaeo-Christian origin of the ritual regulations of the Christian Church. The mention of the Wednesday and Friday fasts, and of the threefold repetition of the Lord's Prayer, with the doxology (which, however, took the place of the Amen, and no more belonged to the Lord's Prayer than to any other prayer; see x. 5, and Taylor p. 67), is very interesting as carrying back these practices to primitive times. Further, the regulations about baptism have a very high interest: (1) as implying that baptism 'in the name of the Lord' is baptism performed 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost'; see ix. 5, vii. 1: (2) for the evidence of the use of 'trine affusion' in the earliest Church, vii. 3: (3) for the prescription of fasting for the baptizer and the baptized, vii. 4. This practice in the case of the baptizer did not apparently die out, as the commentators seem to think: see St. Chrysostom's answer to his accusers, *Ep.* cxxv. p. 668: καθελέτωσαν καὶ τὸν Παῦλον ὃς μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι ὁλόκληρον τὸν οἶκον ἐβάπτισεν. He seems to mean that St. Paul baptized after eating, and that this would be an ecclesiastical offence. He is, however, forgetting the order of events in the original passage, Acts xvi. 33, 34; and the context possibly makes his meaning ambiguous: (4) for the bearing of these Judaic regulations on the history of infant baptism. The Christian Church would presumably have carried on the Jewish practice of infant baptism. See Taylor on the 'little proselytes,' pp. 55-58 (very suggestive on the theory of infant baptism); and Sabatier *La Didachè*, pp. 84-88: 'l'Eglise, en donnant au baptême une signification nouvelle, ne

[1] *New Testament—Notes on Select Readings*, p. 9. Harnack calls attention to the omission of ἡ βασιλεία before ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα, an omission which occurs also in the Sahidic (Egyptian) version. This he thinks is a 'subtle' indication of Egyptian origin (*op. cit.* p. 26). But the same reading appears in Gregory of Nyssa. It was probably the original Jewish form.

[2] viii. 2, x. 5. It is hardly fair to quote the Aramaic *Maranatha* (x. 6) as an indication of Palestinian origin, in view of 1 Cor. xvi. 22. I suppose the produce of the land from which firstfruits are to be taken—cattle, flocks, corn, wine, oil—would suit most eastern countries.

s'écarta cependant pas beaucoup dans le principe de la discipline du baptême juif.' In ch. ix. 'Eucharist' is clearly used technically, and the *Didache* therefore throws back the date of the technical use. And the mention, in ch. xiv. 1, of the confession of transgressions before public prayer casts a strong light on the history of public confession in the Christian Church (compare St. James v. 14-16, and 1 St. John i. 9 with Westcott's note): this confession still retains its place in the *Canons of Hippolytus*, c. ii., but in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii. 14, 3) it is turned into 'Thou shalt confess thy sins to the Lord thy God.'

M

DR. HORT'S VIEW OF THE APOSTOLATE.

(*See p.* 200.)

Dr. Hort speaks of himself[1] as 'led to the conclusion that in its original sense the term Apostle was not intended to describe the habitual relation of the Twelve to our Lord during the days of His ministry, but strictly speaking only that mission among the villages of which the beginning' is described in St. Mark vi. 7, 12, and the end in St. Mark vi. 30. He admits that in St. Luke's Gospel 'the term is not throughout confined to this limited usage.'[2] In fact the word is used six times in St. Luke, and only once in connexion with this special mission. St. John does not use the word at all as a designation for the Twelve. St. Matthew uses it once in the list of the Twelve (x. 2) in such a way as to suggest that it was an habitual name for them ('now the names of the twelve apostles are these'), and not as connected with any particular mission. Finally, in St. Mark the word is used (for certain) only once (vi. 30), and as it were accidentally, of the Twelve when they returned from the special mission alluded to. And its appearance of exclusive reference to that mission in St. Mark's narrative depends (1) on the doubtful reading of iii. 14, 'And He appointed twelve [whom also He named apostles] that they might be with him, and that he *might send them forth to preach and to have authority to cast out devils*';[3] and (2) also on the limitation of the words in italics to the mission subsequently described in similar terms in vi. 12, 13. But just before (vi. 7) the words occur, 'He *began* to send them forth.' This first mission was only a type of much that was to come. It was not the entire scope of their apostolate, but the first example of it. On

[1] The *Christian Ecclesia* (Macmillan, 1897), p. 28. [2] P. 26.

[3] On the reading see Swete *in loc.* The words in brackets are in the *margin* of the R.V. There is a great deal to be said for attributing them to assimilation to St. Luke vi. 13: they are omitted by some good Greek authorities and by all the early Latin and Syriac witnesses.

the whole, I think it must be admitted that Dr. Hort's proposed limitation of the original meaning of the term 'apostle' is very weakly supported by the evidence.

But it is a more important matter that he denies (on the whole) that the apostolate was even finally an office of government constituted by our Lord in His Church. He does indeed use the word 'office' (p. 19) of the Twelve,[1] and speaks of a 'distinctive function' reserved for them 'throughout, over and above their function as the chiefest disciples' (p. 29). But he says (p. 84), 'there is indeed, as we have seen, no trace in Scripture of a formal commission of authority for government from Christ Himself. Their commission was to be witnesses of Himself, and to bear that witness by preaching and by healing.' He thinks that the actual authority in matter of government and administration which in the Acts they are found exercising was due to the 'spontaneous homage' of the Christians of Judaea, and was a result of the moral authority involved in their personal qualification. He thinks it very doubtful how far their authority 'is likely to have been felt and acknowledged beyond the limits of the Holy Land.' In other words (p. 230), their definite function was simply to be witnesses and to make their witness known. 'Round this, their definite function, grew up in process of time an indefinite authority, the natural and right and necessary consequence of their unique position,' but 'it came to the apostles by the ordinary action of divine providence, not (as far as we can see) by any formal divine command.' 'The apostles were not in any proper sense officers of the ecclesia.'

Now this is (for the argument of this book) an exceedingly important matter (see Preface p. xii), and I would endeavour here to show how contrary to the evidence as a whole, in my judgment, Dr. Hort's theory is. I have in Chap. IV. collected the evidence for saying that the Twelve were really (as has been almost universally supposed) trained and appointed to be officers of the Christian Church for the purposes of government. Of that evidence only a part is noticed by Dr. Hort. Thus he does not notice our Lord's answer to Peter about the 'stewardship' in the 'household of servants' (St. Luke xii. 41-43, see above p. 200). He does indeed very briefly discuss St. Matt. xvi. 19 ('I will give unto thee the keys,' etc.), but it is only for the purpose of determining the relation of 'the Church' to 'the kingdom of heaven,' and even so the words are exceedingly disappointing and ambiguous. 'The simplest inference from the language used would be that the office committed to St. Peter and the rest with respect to the Ecclesia, would enable him and them to fulfil the office here described as committed to him, with respect to the kingdom of heaven.'[2] An office

[1] See also p. 160: 'The apostolate of the Twelve and St. Paul was in an important sense a definite and permanent office.' (But by appointment from the Ecclesia?)

[2] P. 19. We must remember that the work is posthumous. Dr. Hort could hardly have left the sentence as it stands.

to be intrusted by Christ Himself to the apostles in relation to the Church (and surely a tremendous office—to open and shut the kingdom of heaven) is here apparently incidentally admitted, but no further consideration is given to this (I cannot but think) really luminous and central passage (see above p. 202), and the admission, for what it is worth, is not alluded to further.[1] Once more, I have, like many others, argued that the commissions after the Resurrection (1) appear to be given distinctively to the Twelve, and (2) that they are commissions to an abiding apostolate. On point (1) Dr. Hort only says that 'doubt is possible' (p. 33), and 'granting that it was probably to the Eleven that our Lord directly and principally spoke on both these occasions (and even to them alone when he spoke the words at the end of St. Matthew's Gospel), yet it still has to be considered in what capacity they were addressed by Him.' I say that the words of the commissions themselves bear witness that they were addressed to them as envoys, apostles—representatives no doubt of the missionary and judicial functions of the whole Church, but representatives because they were divinely commissioned officers ('apostles,' 'stewards,' 'pastors') in the society.

Once more, I have argued that 'if the Acts is accepted as historical, undoubtedly the apostles must have received a commission distinct from the Church as a whole to account for their position' (p. 207 n.[3]). Dr. Hort surely greatly minimizes the position of the apostolate in the Acts. He does not notice that St. Peter at once alludes to the apostolate of Judas, as an office of administration which is vacant and should be filled up. He alludes (p. 38) to the words διακονία and ἀποστολή as used by St. Peter (i. 25), but not to the phrase quoted from the Psalm, 'his office (ἐπισκοπή) let another take' (i. 20). Moreover it appears to most of us that it is plainly in virtue of their apostolate that the Twelve stand forth from the first as having authority in the community. There is no trace of their position growing from 'spontaneous homage.' They assume the right to 'appoint' the seven, whom the Church as a whole is to choose (vi. 3). In fact, if certain men have authority to impart the gift of the Holy Ghost, whether for living or for governing, by the laying-on of their hands (and only of *apostles* is such a phrase used[2])—this gift of the Holy Ghost being the essential constituent of the Christian life—such men are rendered by this very power necessary and central authorities in the community.

Again, Dr. Hort thinks Barnabas was sent to Antioch (xi. 22) in

[1] Dr. Sanday likewise deals to my mind very inadequately with this passage (*The Conception of Priesthood* p. 48). He says, 'a similar promise' is given to the whole body, i.e. in xviii. 18. But without the distinctive and definite words for stewardship 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' These words connect themselves with the stewardship of St. Luke xii. 41 ff. The legislative authority ('binding' or 'loosing') belongs in some sense to the Church as a whole. The stewardship is an office in the Church committed to the apostle.

[2] Acts viii. 18, xix. 1-7; Rom. i. 11; 2 Tim. i. 6.

place of one of the Twelve to avoid 'putting forth even the semblance of apostolic authority there' (p. 60); but there is not a word in the narrative to suggest this: and when the great question was raised at Antioch about circumcising the Gentiles, certainly the church there appears to recognise an authority at Jerusalem. That authority, after being appealed to and deliberating, sends them a decision by letter and messengers (xv. 22-31)—'it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to *lay upon you*' such and such necessary 'burdens' and requirements and no more. And it is implied in the course of this letter that though they had in fact given no authorization—'no commandment'—to those who had gone to Antioch previously and stirred up dissension, yet they might have done so. They had authority to 'give commandment.' The letter goes out in the name of the 'apostles and elder brethren' at Jerusalem. I have spoken of it as 'representing substantially' the authority of the apostles. Dr. Sanday (*Conception of Priesthood* p. 44 n.) complains this is not 'strict exegesis.' Does this mean that it does not inhere in the particular words (xv. 23) taken by themselves? It certainly does not. But what gave the church at Jerusalem authority to send a mission of this kind to another church? The whole Acts would assure us it was because the church at Jerusalem contained the apostles, and the apostles were the Church's authoritative teachers and centre of unity.

Further, Dr. Hort, in restricting the authority of the apostles to Jerusalem, has not considered all the language which St. Paul uses (see above p. 211 ff.) to describe the authority which he conceives to belong to him 'in all the churches' equally—'for edification not destruction,' but with 'destructive' powers attached—simply because he is an apostle. He only notices where St. Paul does not (he says) assert it—viz., in his letter to the Romans. The 'total absence' (in this epistle) 'of any claim to authority illustrates how large a part of the authority which he exercised towards other Ecclesiae was not official, so to speak, but personal'—the authority of a founder (pp. 133, 197). Now no doubt it is in accordance with St. Paul's tact that he would not speak of authority to those who did not know him. But even here he justifies his 'boldness' in addressing them by the fact of the universal and quasi-priestly mission divinely given him towards the whole Gentile world (xv. 15-17). Here is the ground of an authority which he must exercise according to his judgment of fitness, whether at Rome or elsewhere.

On the whole, Dr. Hort's argument against the existence of an apostolic office of government ordained by Christ Himself is singularly unconvincing. He does not deal at all satisfactorily either with the language of the Gospels, or with the position assigned to the apostles in the Acts, or with the claim which St. Paul plainly attached to the apostolic office or stewardship, and which he delegates to his representatives, Timothy and Titus, as, according to Dr. Hort's own phrase, 'a paramount authority' (p. 197) at Ephesus and Crete.

INDEX

Aaron. See Levitical Priesthood.
Abercius of Hieropolis (Avircius Marcellus) 113 n.
Abilius of Alexandria 115 n.
Abraham Echellensis 316 n.
Achaia, Church of 115.
Achatius, Bp. 192 n.
Achelis, H. von 132 n., 133 n.
Adamnan 150 n.
Addaeus (Addai) 112.
Aelia Capitolina 110.
Aelius Lampridius 86 n.
Aerius 126 n., 147 ff., 195.
Africa, Churches of 115 ff., 152 n., 155 n.
Agabus 354.
Aggaeus 112 n.
Agrippinus of Alexandria 318.
Albinus Flaccus (Alcuin) 75 n.; pseudo- 254 n., 326 n., 339, 346.
Alcibiades (Miltiades) 350 ff.
Alcuin. See Albinus Flaccus.
Alexander of Alexandria 316, 319 n.
Alexander of Basilinopolis 344.
Alexander Severus, Emperor 86.
Alexandria, Church of 86, 89, 98 n., 185 n.; theology 20 ff., 51; succession 111 n., 115 ff.; episcopate and presbyterate 137 n., 149, 166, 291 n., 300, 302, 315 ff., 332 ff., 337.
Alford, H. 211 n., 213 n.
Allen, A. V. G. 48 n.
Amalarius of Treves 315, 326 n., 339.
Amastris 113.
Ambrose, St., of Milan 72 n., 81, 146 n., 184 n., 217 n., 309 n., 335 n., 339, 356 n.
Ambrosiaster: on presbyters 119, 135, 157, 159 n., 245 n., 273 n., 314, 315; ministry 183, 335 ff., 347, 356.
Ammia 254, 351, 355.
Ananias 139 n., 231 n.
Ancyra, Church of 102 n.
Andreas, commentator 228 n.
Andrew, St., in Asia Minor 258.
Andronicus 210 n., 248 n.
Anecdota Maredsolana 281 n.
Anencletus of Rome 287, 288 n.
Anicetus of Rome 17, 103 n., 105, 109.
Annianus of Alexandria 115 n., 316 ['Hananias'], 317.
Anselm, St., of Canterbury 149 n.
Antioch, Church of 39, 231 n., 232 ff., 271 n., 272, 291, 354 ff., 381 ff.; succession at 111.
Antiochus Epiphanes 361.
Antoninus Pius, Emperor 24.
Apamea 113.
Apollonius 352.
Apollos 234, 235 n.
Apophthegmata 121 ff.
Apostolic Canons 173 n., 175 n., 319, 367.
Apostolic Church Order 247, 319, 367, 372 ff.; ministry 251, 254 n., 270 n., 279 n., 360.
Apostolic Constitutions 247, 319, 370 n; date 131, 372; rites 138 ff., 341, 344 ff., 347, 367, 372 ff.; ministry 131 ff., 139 n., 147 n., 148 n., 166 n., 169 n., 181, 183 n., 245 n., 254 n., 257 n., 269, 282 n., 285 n., 321 n., 326 n., 356, 360.
Appian 360.
Archippus 221 n.
Arethas of Caesarea 228 n.
Aristides 24, 74 n.
Aristion 258.
Aristotle 43, 67 f.
Arius 126 n.
Arrian 360.
Ascoli, G. I. 357 n., 358 n.
Asia, Church of 100 ff., 112 ff., 141, 245 n., 258, 268, 271 ff., 302.
Athanasius, St., of Alexandria 116 n., 122, 124, 129 n., 156, 175 n., 179, 319 n., 330, 347, 371 n., 373, 374 n.; on the Church 21, 51; ministry 120, 129 n., 144, 195; pseudo- 185 n., 372.
Athenagoras 180.
Athens, Church of 114, 221 n., 273.
Augustine, St., of Hippo: on the Church 11, 14 n., 16 n., 17 n., 36, 41 n., 50 n., 153 n.; priesthood 75 n., 81, 155 n.; councils 155 n., 162 n.; ordination 166 n., 174 n., 176, 177 n., 338 n., 341, 346 n., 347 n.

Bacchyllus of Corinth 114.
Barnabas, St. 66 n., 216 n., 230 ff., 354, 381.
Barnabas, Epistle of 373.
Bartlet, J. V. 135 n.
Basil, St., of Caesarea 97, 110 n., 146 n., 162 n., 174, 177 n., 329, 343, 347.
Basilides 342.
Baucalis 126 n.
Baur, F. C. 224 n., 362 n.
Bede 44 n., 149 n.
Benedictine rule 332.
Beneschewitsch, V. N. 328 n.
Benson, Abp. E. W. 153 n.
Bernaldus of Constance 340.
Bernard, St. 83 n., 149 n.
Bernard, Abp. J. H. 3 n., 17 n., 284 n.
Berytus, succession at 110.
Bigg, C. 22 n., 66 n., 75 n., 116 n., 144 n., 185 n., 247 n., 315 n., 318, 320, 374.
Bilson, Bp. T. 60 n.
Bingham, J. 86 n., 88 n., 89 n., 167 n., 174 n., 326 n., 330, 331 n., 332.
Boissier, G. 26 ff., 29 n., 30.
Bonwetsch, N. 187 n., 192 n., 349 ff., 353 n.
Bramley, H. R. 146 n.
Bright, W. 75 n., 175 n., 333.
Brightman, F. E. 131 n., 283 n., 320 n., 321, 333, 340.
Brooks, E. W. 122.
Bryennios, Abp. 372 ff.
Burkitt, F. C. 112 n.
Burn, A. E. 14 n.
Butler, Abbot C. 121 n.
Butler, Bp. J. 10 n., 92.

Caesarea in Palestine, succession at 110, 111 n.
Callistus of Rome 171.
Cassian 332.
Celadion of Alexandria 317.
Celestine of Rome 90 n.
Celsus 127.
Celtic Church 96 ff., 149 ff., 255 n.
Cerdo of Alexandria 115 n., 317.
Chapman, Dom J. 110 n.
Charisius 360.
Charisma 215 ff., 222 n., 223 ff., 238, 283.
Charles the Great 329, 331, 334.
Chase, Bp. F. H. 224 n.
Chillingworth, W. 93 n.
Chorepiscopi 130 n., 198 n., 327 ff.
Chrism 75 n., 119 n., 159 n., 162 n., 183 n.
Chrysostom, St. John, of Constantinople 88, 378; on orders 137, 146, 148 n., 160 n., 216, 217 n., 236 n., 343; pseudo- 91 n., 326 n., 358.
Church, R. W. 8, 31 n., 37 n.
Clark, W. R. 112 n.
Claudius Apollinaris of Hierapolis 113.
Clement of Alexandria: on the Church 16 n., 21 ff., 23 n., 47; on the Eucharist 66 n., 185 n.; on the ministry 102 n., 109 n., 116 ff., 143, 178, 296, 321 n., 365 n.; traditions in 86 n., 211 n., 224 n., 233 n., 234 n., 244 n., 256 ff., 286 n.
Clement of Rome 105, 107, 253, 273, 286 ff., 288 n., 292; letter 273 ff.; on the Church 19, 37 n., 47; the Eucharist 204 n., 359; ministry 85, 98 n., 114 n., 151 n., 171, 181, 184 ff., 210 n., 219 n., 236 n., 249 n., 270 n., 273 ff., 291, 293 ff., 301 ff., 348, 359 ff., 370 n.
Clement of Rome, pseudo-, II. *Ep. ad Cor.* 17 n.
Clementines 66 n., 109 n., 110 ff., 143, 170 n., 173, 181 n., 198 n., 244 n., 254 n., 269, 286 n., 343, 347, 360; *Apostolic Constitutions q.v.*
Cnossus, Church of 115.
Colgan, J. 150 n.
Collectio Avellana 332.
Collegia 25 ff., 44 ff.
Colluthus 120, 333.
Comana (Coumana) 113.
Confessors 134.
Connolly, Dom R. H. 135 n.
Constantine, Emperor 125.
Constantius, Emperor 126, 156.
Corinth 109, 114 ff., 213 ff., 268 n., 274 n., 275 ff., 284, 286, 296, 297 n., 302, 353.
Cornelius of Rome 151 n., 333, 342 ff.
Cornelius a Lapide 356 n.
Councils:—
Ancyra 141, 142 n., 327 ff.
Antioch 175 n., 328, 330.
Arles 162, 172, 175.
Capua 172 n.
Carthage 162.
Carthage, Canons of iv. Council. See *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua.*
Chalcedon, 47, 175 n., 257 n., 328.
Constantinople 175 n.
Ephesus 174 n.
Elvira (Illiberis, Eliberis) 97, 162, 183 n.
Florence 57 n.
Gangra 147 n., 328.
Hippo Regius 162 n.
Laodicea 142 n.
Neocaesarea 142 n., 198 n., 328, 330.

Nicaea, 123, 135 n., 142, 172, 175 n., 183, 328, 330, 332.
Orleans, 175 n.
Saragossa 175 n.
Sardica 166 n., 174 n., 175 n.
Seville 338 ff.
Toledo 162 n., 174 n.
Trent 98 n.
Tyre 120 n.
Cramer, J. A., *Catena* 228 n.
Crete, Churches of 115, 220 ff.
Cunningham, W. 11 n.
Cureton, W. 259 n.
Cyprian, St., of Carthage 137; on the Church 14, 45, 47, 49 n.; tradition 57 ff.; ministry 86, 89, 123, 143 n., 155 ff., 162, 172, 173 n., 174 n., 181, 183 n., 203 n.; ordination 333, 342 ff.
Cyril, St., of Alexandria 21 n.

Daillé, J. 259 n.
Dale, R. W. 311.
Dalman, G. H. 35 n., 36 n.
Damas of Magnesia 113, 263.
Damasus of Rome 157.
Daniel, deacon 332 ff.
Daniel, H. A. 323.
Darwin, C. 303
Deacon 236, 239 ff., 293, 357 ff.; functions of 133, 141 ff., 160, 162, 217, 220, 249, 293.
Deaconess 214 n., 230 n., 240.
Delisle, L. 323 ff.
Demetrius of Alexandria 116, 126 ff., 316 ff.
Denny and Lacey 166 n.
Denton, W. 80, 95.
Develtum 115.
Dictionary of Christian Antiquities 88 n., 98 n., 168 n., 172 n., 174 n., 323, 332, 345 n.
Dictionary of Christian Biography 81 n., 89 n., 100 n., 110 n., 122 n., 126 n., 143 n., 151 n., 154 n., 156 n., 192 n., 333, 349 ff.
Didache 185 n., 253 ff., 367 ff.; on the Church 25 n., 37 n.; sacraments 66 n., 204 n.; ministry 85 n., 179 n., 181 n., 198 n., 210 n., 216 n., 227 n., 234 n., 236 n., 247 ff., 271, 277 n., 279 n., 284, 286, 291, 301, 362 ff.; prophets 216 n., 355 ff.
Didascalia 131 ff., 139 n., 181, 247, 254 n., 269, 285 n., 345, 372.
Didymus 21, 51, 119 n., 207 n., 349 ff.
Dio Cassius 169 n.
Diognetum, Epistola ad 64 n., 74 n.
Dionysius of Alexandria 118, 127, 147 n., 151 n., 315.
Dionysius the Areopagite 114, 221 n., 273.
Dionysius the Areopagite, pseudo- 131, 139 n., 321 n., 326 n., 346 n.
Dionysius of Corinth 113 n., 114 ff., 221 n., 273, 287 n.
Dionysius Exiguus 328, 330.
Dionysius of Halicarnassus 360.
Diotrephes 229.
Domitian, Emperor 246, 274 ff.
Donatists 175 n., 176.
Dracontius 144, 347.
Duchesne, Mgr. L. 100 n., 291 n., 323.
Duval, R. 112 n.

Ecce Homo [J. R Seeley] 31.
Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima 328.
Edersheim, A. 34 n., 203 n.
Edmundson, G. 247 n., 274 n., 374.
Eleutherus of Rome 100, 106, 109.
Ellicott, Bp. C. J. 221 n.
Emesa 122 ff.
Encratites 177 n.
Enoch, Book of 18 n.
Ephesus 220 ff., 260; succession at 112 257.
Ephraem Syrus 5 n., 112 n., 148 n. 269 n., 321 n.
Epiphanius of Salamis 126 n., 147 ff. 151 n., 286 n., 315, 349 ff., 358.
Erastianism 90 ff., 97.
Estcourt, E. E. 57 n., 94 n.
Estius, G. 216 n.
Eugenius IV., Pope 57 n.
Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 17, 24 n., 88 n., 100 ff., 127 n. 147 n., 149 n., 151 n., 179 n., 194 n 217 n., 219 n., 234 n., 237 n., 243, 245, 246 n., 253, 254 n., 256 n., 257 n., 258 n., 273 n., 285 n., 287 n., 291 n. 315 n., 318 n., 333, 342, 349, 355 373.
Eustathius of Sebaste 147 n.
Eutychius of Alexandria 121, 125 ff. 315 ff.
Evangelists 199 n., 238 ff., 248, 253.
Evetts, B. T. A. 317 ff.

Fabian of Rome 169 n.
Fabius of Antioch 151 n., 342.
Felicissimus 333.
Felicitas, St. 350.
Férotin, Dom M. 325 n.
Field, F. 35 n.
Findlay, G. G. 3 n.
Firmilian, St., of Caesarea 102 n., 143 n., 152 n.
Foucart, P. 27 n., 29 n.

Fowler, J. T. 150 n.
Funk, F. X. 131 n., 132 n.

Gaius, Emperor 28 n.
Gaius of Thessalonica 115 n., 221 n.
Galen 281 n.
Gaul 100, 149, 291 n.
Gebhardt and Harnack 277 n.
Gelasian Sacramentary 75 n., 323 ff., 327.
Gieseler, J. C. L. 340.
Gladstone, W. E. 65 n., 68 n., 94 n., 99, 209 n.
Godet, F. 6, 198 n., 201 n., 207 n.
Gore, Bp. C. 204 n., 225 n.
Gortyna, Church of 115.
Grapte 292 n.
Greece, Church of 114.
Gregorian Sacramentary 163 n., 323, 327.
Gregory of Alexandria 86.
Gregory, St., of Nazianzus 110 n., 129 n., 145 ff., 343, 347.
Gregory, St., of Nyssa 97, 146 n., 378 n.
Gregory of Tours 97, 333.
Guilds. See *Collegia*.

Haddan, A. W. 88 n.
Hadrian, Emperor 24, 114, 117 n.
Hadrian, Pope 329.
Hananias of Alexandria. See Annianus.
Harnack, A. 319 n., 342, 349 ff., 367, 371 n., 372 ff.; on the Church 24, 47 n., 48 n., 185 n.; N.T. documents 2 n., 4 n., 5 n.; ministry 74 n., 151 n., 169 n., 170 n., 171 n., 172 n., 204 n., 244 n., 254 n., 277 n., 279 n., 285 n., 359 n., 362 ff.; Ignatius 259 n., 267 n., 272 n.; Eucharist 204 n., 281 n.
Hatch, E.: on the Church 6 n., 7 n., 8 n., 11 n., 41 n., 44 ff.; guilds 26 n., 27 n., 30 n., 34 n.; baptism 34 n.; ministry 53 ff., 88, 90 n., 151 n., 170 n., 189 n., 198 n., 200 n., 246 n., 269 n., 288 n., 331, 357 ff.; ordination 167, 168 n., 172 n., 174 n., 323, 332 ff., 343 ff.
Hauler, E. 132 n.
Headlam, A. C. 4 n., 132 n., 136, 172 n.
Hefele, Bp. C. J. von 141, 172 n., 174 n.
Hegesippus 109, 111, 114, 233 n., 243, 244 n., 245, 246, 269, 273, 285 n., 286 ff.
Heraclas of Alexandria 118, 126 ff., 315 n., 316 ff.
Hermas, *The Shepherd* of: date 292; on the Church 10 n., 17 ff., 46, 48 n., 254; ministry 273, 277 n., 284 n., 285, 286 n., 292 ff., 359, 373, 374 n.; prophecy 254, 292, 355 ff.; sacraments 66 n.
Heurtley, C. A. 14 n.
Hickes, Bp. G. 82 n.
Hilarianus Hilarius 157 n.
Hilary, St., of Poitiers 157 n.
Hilary the deacon 157 n., 183.
Hilgenfeld, A. 284 n., 365 n., 366 n.
Hill, J. H. 5 n.
Hippolytus 15 n., 189 n., 194 n., 292 n.; *Canons* 131 ff., 134 ff., 160 n., 172, 379; *Church Order* 85 n., 131 ff., 134 ff., 151 n., 169 n., 179 n., 181 n., 183 n., 188 n., 251, 342, 345 ff., 360, 370 n.; *Constitutiones per Hippolytum* 132 n.; *Ref. Omn. Haer.* 171, 181, 198 n., 254 n., 348, 349.
Hittorp, M., *de divinis catholicae ecclesiae officiis* 75 n., 142 n., 146 n., 163 n., 172 n., 254 n., 315, 323, 325 n., 326 n., 330 n., 338 ff., 345 n.
Hoadly, Bp. B. 41 n.
Holland, H. S. 31 n., 33 n., 38 n., 201 n.
Holtzmann, H. J. 220 n., 224 n., 230 n.
Hooker, R. 9 n., 309 n.
Horner, G. 132 n.
Hort, F. J. A. 30 n., 33 n., 41 n., 110 n., 200 n., 221 n., 222 n., 379 ff.: and see Westcott and Hort.
Hosius of Cordova 120.
Hugh of St. Victor 72 n.

Ibas of Edessa 317.
Ignatius, St., of Antioch, 111 ff., 252, 254, 272, 288 ff., 314, 355, 374 n.; on the Church 10 n., 19 ff., 42, 45 ff., 49, 228 n., 250; Eucharist 66 n., 204 n., 366; ministry and episcopate 136, 143, 151, 151 n., 181, 184 ff., 203 n., 245 n., 255 n., 257, 258 ff., 274, 359, 363 n., 366, 377.
Irenaeus, St., of Lyons 100 ff., 254, 296, 314; on the Church 10 n., 14 ff., 17, 45, 47, 50 n., 65; Eucharist 61, 66 n., 204 n., 281 n.; priesthood 75, 75 n., 178, 181, 219 n.; episcopal succession 100 ff., 111, 149, 151, 194, 257, 260 n., 273, 286 n., 287; ministry 236 n., 243, 245 n., 296, 315 n., 348, 361 n.; prophecy 254, 351, 355.
Isaac. See Ambrosiaster.
Isaiah of Emesa 123.
Ischyras 120.
Isidore, St., of Pelusium 82.
Isidore, St., of Seville 75 n., 97, 142 n.; on orders 163 n., 254 n., 328, 330 ff., 338.
Ivo of Chartres 75 n., 142 n.

James, St., of Jerusalem 109 ff., 226 ff., 233, 238 ff., 243 ff., 250, 268 n., 269, 271 ff., 296; *Ep. of*, genuineness 2; in the Clementines 111 n.
Jehoshua ben Levi 377.
Jerome, St. 157, 207 n., 228 n., 274, 351 n.; on the Church 16 n., 152 n.; priesthood 71, 75 n., 183; episcopate 155 n.; presbyterate 137, 198 n.; ordination 176, 343 ff., 346 n.; episcopate at Alexandria 117 ff., 121 ff., 123 ff., 129, 149, 159, 184 n., 300, 302, 315 ff.; original identity of bishops and presbyters 135, 157 ff., 245 n., 273 n., 335 ff.
Jerusalem, Church of 39, 110, 243 ff., 271, 382.
Jevons, F. B. 27 n., 29 n.
John the Baptist, St. 34, 35.
John, St. 100 ff., 228, 256 ff., 268, 295 ff., 354; author of Gospel 5 n.; Syriac history of, 112 n.
John the presbyter 258.
Josephus 28 n., 244 n., 361.
Joshua, high priest 74.
Judas Barsabbas 234 n., 285.
Judas Iscariot 361, 381.
Jude, St. 46; descendants of 246; epistle 226 n.
Julian, Emperor 329.
Julianus of Alexandria 318.
Julianus of Apamea 113 n.
Julius of Rome 86.
Julius Africanus 111 n., 115 n.
Junias 210 n., 248 n.
Justin Martyr, St., *Apologies* 15, 66 n., 167, 254 n., 366; *Dialogue with Trypho* 24, 74 ff., 180, 181 n., 254 n., 281 n., 351, 355.

Krawutzcky, A. 373 n.
Kühl, E. 220 n., 221 n., 222 n., 224 n., 250 n., 267 n., 281 n., 357, 357 n., 361 n., 364 n.
Kühn, C. G. 281 n.

Labbe and Coleti *Concilia* 257 n.
Lacey. See Denny and Lacey.
Langen, J. 105 n., 157 n., 284 n., 295 n., 311 ff.
Laodicea in Syria, succession at 110, 111 n.
Laurentius Mellifluus of Novara 78 ff.
Law, W. 16 n., 31 n., 35 n., 41 n., 84 n.
Le Bas and Waddington 360.
Leo, St., of Rome 21 n., 51, 75 n., 87, 146 n., 177.
Leonine Sacramentary 323 ff., 327.
Leontius of Magnesia 257 n.
Levitical Priesthood 62, 73, 75, 81, 128 n., 144 ff., 153 n., 156, 164, 169 ff., 276, 280, 286 n., 324, 335 n., 338, 357.
Liberatus of Carthage 129 n.
Liddon, H. P. 59 n., 68 n., 70 n., 71, 96 n., 270 n.
Lightfoot, Bp. J. B. 4 n., 20 n., 28, 66 n., 110 n., 112 n., 117 n., 131 n., 266 n., 292 n., 360 n., 361 ff., 370 n.; on deacons 236 n.; Ignatian letters 49 n., 259 ff.; canon xiii of Ancyra 327 ff.; sacerdotalism 62 n., 71, 75 n., 179 n., 182 n., 270 n.; ministry 210 n., 233 n., 283 n.; episcopate 109, 113 n., 115 n., 116 n., 119, 120 n., 151 n., 221 n., 222 n., 228 n., 244 n., 245 n., 256 n., 257 ff., 268 n., 273, 274 n., 277 n., 279 n., 282 n., 284 n., 286 n., 287, 288 n., 290 n., 291 n., 327 ff., 336 n.; *Dissertation* 311 ff.
Linus of Rome 273, 287, 288 n.
Liudger, St. 333 ff.
Loening, E. 30, 349 n.
Lucian of Samosata 30 n., 358.
Lucifer of Cagliari 156, 176 n., 343, 348.
Lux Mundi 81 n.
Lyons, Church of 149.

Macaulay, Lord 93.
Macedonia 114 ff.
Magnesia, Church of 112, 260.
Makin, El- (Georgius Homadius) 318 n.
Malan, S. C. 198 n., 318 n.
Maqrizi, Taqi-ed-Din El- 318 n.
Marcion 113 n., 115.
Marcus Aurelius, Emperor 149.
Mareotis 120 n., 330.
Mark, St. 115, 118, 129 n., 316.
Maronite rite 345 n.
Martene, Dom E. 323, 327, 345 n.
Martyrium Polycarpi 10 n., 260 n., 290 n., 370 n.
Mason, A. J. 50 n., 52 n., 75 n., 86, 175 n., 183 n.
Matthias, St. 12, 229.
Maurice, F. D. 31 n., 65 n., 71 n., 199.
Maximilla 349 ff.
Maximin, Emperor 141.
Mazzini, Joseph 84.
Meletian schism 151 n., 175 n., 332.
Meletius of Lycopolis 175 n.
Melito of Sardis 24 n., 113.
Mesopotamia 112 n.
Meyer, H. A. W. 206 n., 353 n.
Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 148 n., 183 n., 316 n.: *Patrologia Latina*, 332.
Milligan, W. 31 n., 38 n., 44 n., 228 n., 306, 307 n.

Miltiades. See Alcibiades.
Minucius Felix 25.
Missale Francorum 323 ff.
Moberly, R. C. 182 n., 202 n.
Möhler, J. A. 58 n.
Mohammed 54 n.
Mommsen, Th., 26 n., 27 n., 117 n.
Montanism, 100, 102 n., 113 n., 115, 116 n., 186 ff., 197, 203 n., 349 ff., 374, 377.
Monumenta Germaniae Historica 333.
Morin, Dom G., 157 n., 279 n., 281 n., 325 n.
Morinus, *de Sacris Ordinationibus* 57 n., 98 n., 131 n., 139 n., 160 n., 161 n., 169 n., 170 n., 173 n., 174 n., 177, 178 n., 321 n., 323 ff., 330 ff., 340 n., 345 n.
Müller, J. 236 n., 244 n.
Muratori, L. 323, 327, 345 n.
Muratorian Canon 257, 258 n., 292, 351.

Narcissus of Jerusalem 110.
Newman, Cardinal J. H. 44 n., 92 n., 346.
Nicephorus of Constantinople 373.
Nicholas I., Pope 331.
Novatian schism 47, 90 n., 151, 175 n., 177 n, 189 n., 194, 333, 342.
Novatus 333.
Numidicus 153 n., 172.

O'Dwyer, M. 159 n.
Oecumenius 236 n.
Onesimus of Ephesus 113.
Optatus, St., of Mileum 155 n.
Origen 126, 203 n., 222 n., 227 n., 228 n., 317 ff.; on the Church 16 n., 17 n., 20 n., 21 ff., 24 n.; ministry 126 ff., 144, 296; priesthood 75 n., 102 n., 110 n., 115 n., 116 n., 126 ff., 178, 181; traditions in 115 n., 221 n., 245 n., 259 n., 291 n., 292 n., 319, 342, 351, 355.
Otto III., Emperor 333.
Oxyrhynchus 332.

Pacian of Barcelona 221 n.
Palestine, Church in 258; succession in 109 ff., 246, 268, 285, 302.
Palladius, *Lausiac History* 121 n.
Palmas of Amastris 113 n.
Pamphilus 318.
Paphnutius, abbot 149 n., 332 ff.
Papias of Hierapolis 101, 113, 219 n.
Paschal controversy 100, 110, 113 ff.
Paschasius Radbert 75 n., 81 n.
Pater, W. 189 n.
Paul, St. 29 n., 216 n., 230 ff., 231 n.; Epistles 2 ff.; on the Church 39 ff.; ministry 210 ff.; prophecy 216, 353; ordination 239 ff.
Paul of Samosata 175 n.
Pearson, Bp. J. 14 n., 259 n., 316 n., 317.
Pepuza 352.
Peregrinus 30 n., 358.
Perpetua, St. 350.
Peshitta 112 n.
Peter, St. 107, 110 n., 111, 173, 272, 354; commission to 5 n., 191 ff., 201 ff., 208; primacy 154 ff., 202 ff.; presbyterate 268 n., 296; prophet 354; in the Clementines 111; Epistle 2; on ministry 226 n.
Philadelphia, succession at 112.
Philip the Apostle 258.
Philip the Evangelist 217 n., 237.
Philippi, Church of 115, 260, 267, 288 ff., 296, 297 n.
Philo 353.
Phoebe 214 n., 215 n.
Photius of Constantinople 318.
Pinytus of Cnossus 115.
Pius of Rome 292 n., 294.
Plato 353.
Pliny 28.
Poemen, abbot 122, 124 ff.
Polybius of Tralles 113.
Polycarp of Smyrna 17, 100 ff., 103 n., 106 n., 107, 113, 114 n., 250, 254, 257, 260, 270 n., 272, 288 ff., 296, 355, 360 ff.; prophet 250, 254, 290; letter to Philippi 273, 288 ff., 295, 302.
Polycrates of Ephesus 113, 179 n., 254 n., 256, 258 n., 287 n.
Pontus, Churches of 113.
Portus 151 n.
Pothinus of Lyons 100, 149 n., 217 n.
Potter, Abp. J. 95.
Pfaff, C. F. 245 n.
Pfleiderer, O. 4 n., 19 n., 41 n., 42 n.
Presbyter (πρεσβύτερος) 147 n., 220 n., 257 n., 270 n., 277 n., 297 n., 327 ff., 357.
Presbyterate 223, 227, 235 ff., 239, 292, 295, 357 ff.; functions of 118 ff., 133 ff., 163 ff., 219, 227, 235, 239, 332 ff.; ordination to 134 ff.
Presbyter-bishops 217, 219 ff., 235 ff., 239, 253, 284 ff., 295 ff., 300, 302, 332 ff., 357 ff.
Primus of Alexandria 115 n., 317.
Primus of Corinth 114.
Prisca 187 n., 328, 349.
Priscillian 14 n., 87.

Prophets 216 n., 233 ff., 238, 249, 285 ff., 293.
Ptolemais 110.
Publius of Athens 114.
Puller, F. W. 155 n.
Pusey, E. B. 38 n.

Quadratus of Athens 114, 254, 351, 355.
Quaestiones in V. et N. Test. (see Ambrosiaster) 119, 157, 172 n., 337 ff., 347.

Rabanus Maurus 75 n., 142 n., 163 n., 166 n., 254 n., 330, 339 ff.
Rackham, R. B. 4 n., 88 n., 327 ff.
Ramsay, Sir W. M. 3 n., 4 n., 26 n., 27 n., 28 n., 113 n., 172 n., 225 n., 274 n., 367 n.
Raymund of Sabunde 298 n.
Reeves, Bp. W. 149 n.
Reimar, H. S. 169 n.
Reinach, S. 172 n.
Renan, E. 48 n., 229, 236 n.
Renaudot, E. 317 ff.
Rendall, F. 369 n.
Reuter, H. 11 n.
Robertson, Bp. A. 11 n., 16 n., 31 n., 36 n.
Robertson, F. W. 67 n.
Robinson, J. Armitage 110 n., 247 n., 374 ff.
Rome, Church of 18 ff., 155, 214 ff., 274, 302; succession at 105 ff., 149, 267 n., 287; bp. 88 ff., 296.
Rosmini, A., 90 n.
Rothe, R. 15 n., 16 n., 18 n., 22 n., 245 n.
Routh, M. J. 327 ff.
Rufinus 14 n., 122.
Rufus 289 n.
Ruinart, Th. 192 n.

Sabatier, A. 3 n.
Sabatier, P. 34 n., 227 n., 229 n., 367 n., 369, 371 n., 377 n., 378.
Sabinus 342.
Sagaris of Laodicea 113.
Sa'id Ibn Batrik 315 ff.
Salmasius 210 n.
Salmon, G. 3 n., 4 n., 110 n., 151 n., 192 n., 197, 287 n., 292 n., 296 n., 349, 360 n., 367 n., 369 n.
Sanctus, deacon 149 n.
Sanday, W. 36 n., 44 n., 182 n., 192, 360 n., 361, 364 n., 381 n., 382.
Schaff, P. 228 n., 367 n., 370 n.
Schlecht, J. 373 n.
Schürer, E. 236 n., 357.
Schulthess, F. 328 ff.
Scythia 291 n.
Selden, J. 121, 316 n.
Serapion of Antioch 111.
Serapion of Thmuis 131, 138, 320, 343, 372, 377.
Servianus 24 n., 117 n.
Severus of Antioch 121ff., 129, 316.
Severus of Eshmunain 317 ff.
Shirley, W. W. 222 n.
Sidon, succession at 110, 111 n.
Silas, 234 n., 285.
Silvester of Rome 333.
Simcox, W. H. 39 n., 130 n., 180, 221 n., 228 n., 244 n., 256 n.
Simon the Cananaean 123.
Sinope 113.
Smyrna, succession at 112, 257.
Socrates Scholasticus 89, 175 n., 329, 332.
Sodalicia. See *Collegia.*
Soter of Rome 106, 109.
Souter, A. 119 n., 157 n., 337 n.
Sozomen 291 n.
Stanley, A. P. 213 n.
Stanton, V. H. 16 n., 31 n., 35 n., 46, 303 n.
Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua 163 n., 169 n., 325 n., 326 n.
Stephanas 215 n.
Stephen of Rome 52, 81, 143 n., 152 n.
Swete, H. B. 148 n., 297 n., 339, 362, 379 n.
Symeon of Jerusalem 110, 244, 246, 268 n.
Symeon of Thessalonica 131, 139 n.
Synesius of Ptolemais 344.
Syria, Church of 111 ff., 141, 254, 268, 271 ff., 291, 302.

Tarasis 172 n.
Tatian 5 n.
Taylor, C. 34 n., 204 n., 249 n., 367 n., 369 n., 376 n., 377 ff.
Taylor, Bp. Jeremy 69.
Teaching of the Apostles. See *Didache.*
Tertullian on the Church 12 ff., 16 n., 24 n., 29, 50 n.; sacraments 66 n., 163, 164 n., 167, 183 n., 184 n., 186 ff., 341; priesthood 74 n., 178, 184 n.; ministry 203 n.; Montanism 186 ff., 349 ff.; episcopal succession 102, 107, 113 n., 114 ff., 149, 151 n., 257, 273, 297 n.; pseudo- 349 ff.
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs 358.
Thaddaeus 112 n.
Thaddaeus Massisensis. See Theodore of Mopsuestia.
Thebuthis 245.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, 148 n., 297 n., 339, 362.
Theodoret of Cyrrhus, 172 n., 210 n., 297 n., 317 ['Ancyra'], 343 n., 346.
Theodosius, Emperor 125.
Theophilus of Antioch 25, 111.
Theophylact 203 n., 217 n.
Therapius, Bp. 155 n.
Thessalonica 214, 291; succession at 115.
Thomas, Acts of 112 n.
Thomas Aquinas, St. 75 n., 334.
Thomassin, L. 161 n.
Thrace 115.
Thraseas of Eumenia 113.
Timothy and Titus 217 n., 219 ff., 239, 257 n., 268 n., 285, 297 n., 336, 349, 354, 382.
Tixeront, L. J. 100 n., 112 n.
Todd, J. H. 149 n., 150 n.
Trajan, Emperor 28, 259 n.
Tralles 260; succession at 112.
Trench, Abp. R. C. 30 n., 228 n.
Tripolis, succession at 110, 111 n.
Turner, C. H. 135 n., 151 n., 327 ff.
Two Ways, The 372 ff.
Tymium 352.
Tyre, succession at 110, 111 n.

Ursinus, anti-pope 157 n.
Ussher, Abp. J. 259 n.

Valens, presbyter 289 n.
Venosa inscriptions 357 n.
Victor of Capua 5 n.
Victor of Rome 17, 50 ff., 101, 287 n., 343.
Victorinus, Marius 21.
Victorinus of Pettau 75 n., 228 n.
Vienne. See Lyons.
Vincent of Lerins 50 n.
Vitringa 30 n.

Waddington. See Le Bas and Waddington.
Walafrid Strabo 75 n.
Warfield, B. B. 247 n., 367 n.
Weizsäcker, C. von 224 n.
Westcott, Bp. B. F. 7 n., 14 n., 31 n., 44 n., 207 n., 227 n.
Westcott and Hort 112 n., 203 n., 378.
Whately, Abp. R. 31 n.
Willehad, St. 333 ff.
Willis, E. F. 62 n.
Wilson, H. A. 75 n., 163 n., 324.
Winterstein, R., 217 n., 221 n., 289 n.
Wohlenberg, G. 3 n.
Women, ministry of 225 n., 342.
Wordsworth, Bp. C. 233 n.
Wordsworth, Bp. J. 131 n.
Wotherspoon, H. J. 247 n., 374.
Wright, W. 112 n.

Zahn, Th., 5 n., 259 n., 266 n.
Zosimus 289 n.
Zoticos of Comana 113 n.

Printed by T. and A. Constable, Printers to His Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press, Scotland

A060263

BV
665
.G63
1919

Gore, Charles, 1853-1932.
The church and the ministry / by Charles Gore. -- New ed. / revised by C. H. Turner. -- London ; New York : Longmans, Green, 1919.
xxiv, 390 p. ; 23 cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.

Contents: The foundation of the church -- Apostolic succession. -- The witness of Church history -- The institution of the Apostolate. -- The ministry in the Apostolic age. -- The ministry in the sub-apostolic age. -- Conclusions & applications.

A060263

1. Apostolic succession. 2. Church polity--Histo ry--Early church, ca. 30-600. I. T urner, C. H. (Cuthber Hamilton), 18 60-1930. II. Title
19-1409